DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 140 343 CS 203 483

AUTHOR Schreyach, Jon C.
TITLE The Dynamics of Army Writing.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 110p.; M.A. Thesis, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College ; Reproduced from Best Copy Available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Composition Skills (Literary); *Diagnostic Tests; *Expository Writing; Higher Education; Masters Theses; *Military Schools; *Student Attitudes; Technical Writing

ABSTRACT

A survey of attitudes of students in the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College (CGSC) toward writing was analyzed in terms of total population and in terms of ability subgroups established by a diagnostic examination of writing ability. Results were compared with results from a similar survey of the 1974-1975 CGSC class, which was analyzed without the aid of a diagnostic test. Students at the Army War College were also surveyed, to determine their perception of the pressures at work in army writing situations. These perceptions were compared to the current CGSC class, in order to determine points of commonality and areas of disagreement. Results indicated that, although previous CGSC work is valid when total population is considered, important variations existed within the ability subgroups. Further, the study found significant differences of opinion between War College students and CGSC students, concerning the dynamics of army writing. (Author/AA)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE DYNAMICS OF ARMY WRITING

ED140343

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A thesis presented to the Faculty of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE

by

JON C. SCHREYACH, MAJ, USA
B.G.S., University of Nebraska, 1971

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas
1976

CS 223 483

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

Name of candidate Jon Christian Schreyach, Major, Field Artillery

Title of thesis The Dynamics of Army Writing

Approved by:

Paul W Chiders, Research Advisor

Phillip J Brooks, Member, Graduate Research Faculty

[signature], Member, Consulting Faculty

Accepted this 24th day of May 1976 by [signature], Director, Master of Military Art and Science.

The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the individual student author and do not necessarily represent the views of either the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College or any other governmental agency. (References to this study should include the foregoing statement.)

ABSTRACT

This thesis replicates and expands upon previous scholarship. The replication consists of reporting the results of a survey of CGSC student writers which was analyzed in terms of total population and ability sub-groups as established by a diagnostic examination of writing ability. These results are then compared to results from a similar survey of the 1974-75 CGSC class which was analyzed without the aid of a diagnostic test.

The expansion portion of the paper extends the scope of research from the writer level to that of the supervisor. Students at the Army War College were surveyed to determine their perceptions of the pressures at work in Army writing situations. These perceptions are compared to the current CGSC class in order to determine points of commonality and, more important, areas of disagreement.

The study establishes that, although the previous CGSC work is valid when total population is considered, important variations exist within the ability sub-groups. Further, the study establishes that there are significant differences of opinion between War College and CGSC students concerning the dynamics of Army writing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
Chapter	
I INTRODUCTION	1
THE PROBLEM	1
THESIS INTRODUCTION	7
SCOPE	9
STRUCTURE	11
ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS	11
II LITERATURE REVIEW	15
III METHODOLOGY	29
INTRODUCTION	29
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	29
SURVEYS	30
SUMMARY	34
IV FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS	36
INTRODUCTION	36
FINDINGS	37
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	59
V SUMMARY	62
REVIEW	62
CONCLUSIONS	63
SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY	64
ENDNOTES	66

Page

APPENDIXES 72

A. Survey Instructions. 73

B. Total Population Responses 74

C. Above Average Group Responses. 78

D. Average Group Responses. 82

E. Below Average Group Responses. 86

F. Major Bergen's Survey and Responses. 90

G. AWC Survey Instructions. 94

H. AWC Writing Survey 95

BIBLIOGRAPHY 99

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Rank Order of Difficulties	38
2.	Rank Order of Difficulties by Sub-group	38
3.	Relationship Between Perceived Ability and Educational Level (74-75)	39
4.	Relationship Between Perceived Ability and Educational Level (75-76)	40
5.	Relationship Between Perceived Ability and Tested Ability	40
6.	Relationship Between Tested Ability and Rating Experience	41
7.	Relationship Between Tested Ability and Educational Level	41
8.	Perceived Ability Versus Perceived Adequacy of High School/College	43
9.	Non-military Academic Writing Preparation Versus Tested Writing Ability	43
10.	Tested Ability Versus Perceptions of Inadequate Military Education	44
11.	Tested Ability Versus Writing Experience	45
12.	Relationship of Writing Preference and Attitude	46
13.	Writing Preference Versus Attitude (75-76)	46
14.	Tested Ability Versus Writing Preference	47
15.	Tested Ability Versus Attitudes Toward Writing	47
16.	Attitude Versus Rating Experience	48
17.	Rating Experience Versus Rating Practices	49
18.	Tested Ability Versus Rating Practices	49
19.	Perceived Ability Versus Rating Practices	49
20.	Rankings of Environmental Pressures	50
21.	CGSC Rankings of Environmental Pressures	51

LIST OF TABLES (CONT.)

Table		Page
22.	AWC Rankings of Environmental Pressures	52
23.	Rankings of Managerial Pressures.	53
24.	CGSC Rankings of Managerial Pressures	53
25.	Technique--Pressure Equation.	54
26.	AWC Preferred Managerial Techniques	55
27.	Rankings of Personal Pressures.	56
28.	CGSC Rankings of Personal Pressures	56
29.	AWC Rankings of Personal Pressures.	57
30.	Rankings of Pressure Categories	58
31.	CGSC Rankings of Pressure Categories.	58

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

THE PROBLEM

Background to the Problem

During the last two years several articles concerning what Edith Efron has called the "'New' Illiteracy" have appeared in popular magazines, professional journals, and the national press.[1] The concern is that the United States is producing generations of functional illiterates who can neither speak nor write with anything approaching competence.

This matter is of great concern to business leaders and educators alike. Many are appalled at the prospect of young people going off to college--indeed, graduating from college--and entering industry unable to communicate with those around them. Businessmen, realizing that corporate efficiency and, therefore, corporate profits depend directly on the ability of a company's executives to communicate with their employees, are particularly concerned with writing skills, an area which should be--but often is not--of equal concern to the military professional, given the similarity of military and business management functions.

In November 1974 the world of higher education was disturbed by the news that textbook publishers and authors of student information bulletins were finding it necessary to rewrite their college-oriented materials at the ninth grade level so that they would be understood by the incoming freshmen readers.[2] Evidence of this sort

led some educators to conclude that the ability to read has severely atrophied among young people entering college. This concern became ever more pronounced when, in September of 1975, statistics were released by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) showing the average Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores of college-bound high schoolers for the period 1957-1975. These scores revealed a distinct downward trend in recent years. Specifically, there has been a drop of 59 points in the average verbal scores over the last decade. Ten points of that fall-off occurred between 1974 and 1975.[3]

These are only a few indicators of the increasing despair concerning what some see as the death of the English language in America.[4] This fear has been given credence by other disquieting facts.[5]

1. The City University of New York, in 1974, spent $15 million on a remedial English program for their students, many of whom were reading below the ninth grade level.
2. Over 50% of the students planning to become journalism majors at the University of Wisconsin could not pass the minimum admissions standards in grammar, punctuation, and spelling.
3. A full 59% of the students in the University of North Carolina's School of Journalism failed the basic spelling test.

It is evidence like this which has caused charges of illiteracy to be leveled at the current crop of high school and college students.

As is often the case when news of this sort breaks, concerned men and women rushed to their typewriters to identify the perpetrators of what they perceived to be a crime against the language. College teachers blamed high school teachers; high school teachers blamed

grammar school teachers; grammar school teachers blamed parents: and everybody blamed television. Each group had its detractors and its defenders, and the controversy persists with charges and counter-charges making even more complicated what is, essentially, an educational witch hunt.

The two tragic ironies of all this are that the apparent decline of literacy comes in the midst of what may be the greatest information explosion in history,[6] and that the energy being expended to find someone to blame for this state of affairs is in real danger of obstructing efforts to define the problem, if there is one, and design a program(s) to solve it.

Reasons for Military Concern

While this controversy continues in civilian education and industry, similar concerns are being voiced in the military community. It is entirely appropriate that we in the United States Army should be aware of the problem, and at least as concerned as our civilian counterparts in finding a solution to it. Our involvement stems from the fact that the young Americans now on high school and college campuses, who are testing so low in verbal skills, may well be serving as officers in the Army within a few years. Moreover, many of the officers currently on active duty were in school when the reported fall-off in ability was first noted.

Even if there were not a crisis in communication education, we, as professional soldiers, should be concerned about the quality of Army writing and be actively engaged in upgrading this important skill. We prepare millions of pages of field manual documentation each year, through which we try to tell our soldiers how to function,

fight, and survive in combat. We can not afford to do so important a job in a haphazard fashion.

An army mobilizes, trains, moves, and fights in response to written orders.

> At division level and above, the complexity of operations normally requires written directives, reports, orders, and studies. Staff officers at these levels must possess the ability to write accurately, concisely, and clearly.[7]

A flawless tactical plan, devised by competent military professionals, can become impotent if transmitted (via a poorly written, ambiguous order) to the forces who are supposed to execute it. In fact, the infamous military disaster at Balaklava was, in large measure, caused by a poorly written order which was intended to transmit a relatively simple directive to the commander of the Light Brigade, but which failed to take into account the variant perspectives of the communicators involved.[8] Specifically, Lord Raglan, who was the senior British commander on the scene, could see the entire valley and observe enemy (Russian) horsemen advancing with lasso tackle to drag off some British naval guns which had been abandoned on the Causeway Heights that formed the south rim of the valley. It was Raglan's intent to send his Light Brigade to prevent the capture of these guns. Raglan ordered General Airey to write an order to this effect.

> The wording of the order (which still exists) runs: "Lord Raglan wishes the cavalry to advance rapidly to the front--follow the enemy and try to prevent the enemy carrying away the guns. Troop Horse Artillery may accompany. French Cavalry is on your left. Immediate. (Sgd.) R. Airey"[9]

Lord Lucan, the Cavalry Commander, and Lord Cardigan, Commander of the Light Brigade, were positioned on the valley floor. They could not see the activity on the Causeway Heights which Raglan meant to counter--the only guns they knew about were the Russian battery at the far end

of the valley. These were the guns they charged and these were the guns that cut them down like wheat.

It is easy to understand the use of written orders on the Crimean battlefield, and to dismiss them as a 19th century phenomenon whose importance vanished forever with the advent of the FM radio and advanced telecommunications. However, on the battlefield of the future, which is expected to be characterized by very sophisticated electronic warfare techniques, the overuse of tactical radio nets will be tantamount to inviting enemy counterfire. Thus, the tactical environment may force maximum use of written messages. If this situation obtains, we must be able to write our tactical messages clearly and concisely. There will be no room for ambiguity because our mission and the lives of our soldiers may hang in the balance.

Effective writing is equally important to us in the noncombat environment. Staff studies, position papers, replies by indorsement, accident reports, incident reports, readiness reports, lesson plans, and routine correspondence are just a few examples of the writing requirements with which an Army officer must contend.

FM 101-5, The Staff Officer's Field Manual, explains the importance of good writing.

> Staff writing is a means of communicating ideas to the commander, subordinate commanders, and other staff officers through . . . formal or informal documents. Effective staff writing conveys the writer's exact meaning and is not subject to misinterpretation.[10]

With the world-wide commitments to which the United States Army is pledged, the ability to communicate effectively is apt to become more, rather than less, critical. We will be trying to cover the same amount of land area that we always have, but with a progressively shrinking force. Therefore, our forces will have to be maneu-

vered rapidly: plans will have to be precise and stipulate exactly what is expected. Ambiguity of assignments and missions cannot and must not be tolerated. This situation dictates that, in a very real sense, our ability to deploy forces and deal with an aggressive move in Europe, for example, may depend on the ability of the staff officers who prepare the plans and orders to express themselves in writing.

As noted earlier, the subject of more effective military writing is receiving attention in Army circles. Three events have pointed to this increased emphasis and given rise to the current study.

First, in December 1974, a Conference on Army Writing was convened at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. The conference was hosted by MG John H. Cushman, Commandant of the United States Army Command and General Staff College (USACGSC), and had as its goals the definition of the Army's writing problems and the formulation of possible solutions to those problems. In attendance were representatives from Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), USACGSC, The United States Military Academy (USMA), most of the Army branch schools, The United States Marine Corps (USMC), Canada and England. I was the representative from the United States Army Air Defense School (USAADS), Fort Bliss, Texas.

The conference concluded that there were, indeed, problems and deficiencies in Army writing and proposed programs to correct them at the various levels of military education.[11] The proposals, however, were based upon the field experiences of the conferees and represented a consensus solution. They were, therefore, very broad in their approach.

The second event which indicated a need for scholarship in the area of Army writing was the publishing in March, 1975, of a memorandum on the subject to all Headquarters, Department of the Army Personnel by

then Secretary of the Army Howard H. Calloway. In his message, Secretary Calloway expressed concern over the status of Army writing and made known his belief that it could and should be improved in an effort to save ". . . time for writers, typists, and readers."[12] It thus becomes obvious that clear, concise, and effective writing is desireable from a cost-effectiveness standpoint, as well as others.

The most recent event which bears directly on the current study was the completion of a Master of Military Art and Science (MMAS) Thesis on Army Writing by Major John D. Bergen (CGSC 74-75).[13] Major Bergen's study is covered more fully in Chapter II, "Review of Literature," but essentially sought to discover the causes of writing problems in the Army through the survey technique. The survey was designed to determine the attitudes and perceptions of the subject population, a randomly selected group of Major Bergen's CGSC classmates. However, Major Bergen was forced to use assumed data (see literature review) for levels of ability, or respondents' percentions of their own ability in his examination of the relationships between attitudes, perceptions, and abilities.

THESIS INTRODUCTION

Purpose

This study is a follow-on to the Bergen thesis and was motivated by that effort and my participation in the writer's conference cited above. The purpose of the study is to verify and update Major Bergen's work with new data that have recently become available and to expand the attitude-survey portion to include not only a sample from CGSC, but also a group of senior Army officers currently attending the Army War College. The survey of the AWC group was originally suggested by Major Bergen in his thesis.

Definition

Army writing is defined as that writing which is done in connection with a military position, and includes such written work as staff studies, fact sheets, plans and orders, position papers, and OER narratives. This definition was provided to survey respondents at both CGSC and the AWC in order to orient their thinking in parallel directions.

Objectives

1. Compare responses of students surveyed by Major Bergen with those of students in the current CGSC (75-76) class.

2. Correlate the demographic data on the surveyed group of officers (CGSC 75-76) with their performance on a standardized commercial test of writing proficiency.

3. Discover the relationships between writers' attitudes towards writing and their tested ability to express themselves in writing.

4. Compare and contrast the perceptions of writers and supervisors in order to postulate possible solutions.

Importance

1. In order to solve the writing problems in the Army, those problems must first be defined and understood. The causes of the problem must also be identified so that we can avoid the common pitfall of treating a symptom rather than the disease. This thesis seeks to verify previous scholarship in this area but with better, more organized data than was available previously.

2. In a study of this nature, the determination of what is right is as important as the discovery of what is wrong. Therefore, the study attempts to describe those traits which good Army writers have in common as well as where these officers differ from their less-

skilled colleagues. This information can then be used to design writing programs which will teach by recognizing an officer's strong points while concentrating chiefly on the individual's weak areas.

5. The survey method, a replication of the Bergen instrument already used at CGSC, provides construct validity for this method and, therefore, enhances its applicability to future research efforts of this type.

4. Analysis of the perceptions of two groups of Army officers, one comprised of staff writers and one comprised of officers for whom staff writing is done, yields an interesting view of Army writing, its problems, and its strengths, and provides insights into actions which can be taken to improve its quality.

SCOPE

Since this study involves considerable replication of previous work, the possible causes of writing problems, as addressed in the surveys used, are grouped into the three categories used in the Bergen study: ability, attitudes, and pressures. The relationships between these categories are based upon survey responses and empirical data on language facility for the entire CGSC survey group. Other relationships considered are those between tested ability and education, experience, source of commission, and branch. Moreover, the perceptions of senior officers are considered and compared with those of potential staff writers.

Attitudes

Attitudes toward writing are analyzed to discover whether there is any correlation between them and ability. Attitudes also indicate

if officers are satisfied with the current system for, and procedures used in, Army writing.

Pressures

These pressures, as in the Bergen study, are classified as managerial, environmental, and personal, and are examined to determine their impact on an officer's ability. Specifically, the officer's perceptions of their importance are correlated with his tested ability.

Environmental Pressures. In this area the study is concerned with the perceived work environment. Such factors as frequent changes of assignment, short suspense dates, and physical working conditions will be investigated to determine their impact on the Army writer.

Managerial Pressures. Here the relationship between a staff writer and his supervisor will be examined. The perceptions of the writer become critical in this area and may color the writing he does. If he perceives his supervisor as a threat, he may be inhibited in his writing and write in other than his normal style in order to "keep the boss happy." On the other hand, a supervisor who has a positive attitude toward writing could imbue his subordinates with those same attitudes and, through positive reinforcement, produce good writing habits in those who work for him.

In this important area, two surveys were used. One was given to a random grouping of students at CGSC in order to determine attitudes toward managerial pressures from the viewpoint of the typical staff officer. The other survey concentrated in the same area, but was administered to students at the Army War College to discover attitudes toward the effects of management on writers from the viewpoint of staff

supervisors. The impact of managerial practices in the area of the work environment was also considered.

Personal Pressures. In this section, the individual's perceptions of himself are studied. They are matched with his tested ability to determine the effects of these self-perceptions on performance. It should not matter, ultimately, whether these perceptions are accurate since an individual behaves in accord with what he believes to be true, rather than what is, in fact, true.[14]

STRUCTURE

This thesis is organized into five chapters:

Chapter I -- Introduction and statement of the problem; background, purpose, scope, objectives, and structure.

Chapter II -- Review of literature.

Chapter III -- Methodology.

Chapter IV -- Findings and interpretations.

Chapter V -- Conclusions, recommendations, and summary.

ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

1. This study assumes that a representative sample of CGSC students typifies the group of officers who will fill staff positions in the United States Army during the foreseeable future.

2. The use of a literature review is based on the assumption that problems which exist in the civilian sphere will parallel problems found in the military. Further, it assumes that techniques found for solving problems in business, industry, and education can, with modification, be applied in the military sphere.

3. The study also assumes that Army officers in the current class at AWC are representative of the senior people who will have supervisory responsibility over Army staff writers in the foreseeable future.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The review of literature is presented to give the reader background in and a basic understanding of the subject. For this thesis, scholarship in several areas was consulted. The fields of organizational psychology, education, and communication theory all yielded particularly valuable insights.

Previous scholarship in the military community, as well as that from business and from civilian education, is reviewed in order to gain an appreciation for the importance of writing and to discover the recommendations of senior officers concerning the teaching of writing in the Army as these ideas are set forth in the proceedings of several senior boards on Army Education.

Literature on Education

Current thinking within the educational community is reviewed to determine how civilian educators perceive writing problems and what steps are being taken to correct them.

Literature on Organizational Writing

In this area, both military and civilian sources are cited. The recent evaluations of Army education conducted by the Haines and Norris boards helped to determine strong and weak areas in Army writing. Moreover, texts on effective writing, such as the Adjutant General School's Special Text 12-160, were scrutinized to ascertain common pitfalls in

military writing.

Civilian literature on organizational communication is surveyed with a view toward discovering the dynamics of writing in the organizational environment and the impact that such things as hierarchical structures have on the communication process in organizations. The insights thus gained should generally be transferable from the business to the military environment.

Literature on Interpersonal Communication

This section of the literature review concentrates on the dynamics of interpersonal writing. Although Army writing should be mainly oriented toward large audiences, we often find writers expressing the view that they write for just one person -- their supervisors. If this contention is even partly true, then the dynamics of interpersonal communication will affect, to some extent, all Army writing.

A problem arises, however, in trying to present the results of the literature survey in a logical format. It is quite common to find the author of a book on organizational communication behavior making reference to education and, similarly, for educators writing in their professional journals to cite examples from business, industry, and government. For this reason, I will organize this chapter into subsections on the nature of the controversy, dynamics of organizational communication, and possible solutions to the problem. This is done in an effort to keep together those comments which apply to a particular functional area regardless of the discipline in which the source was published.

Nature of the Controversy

There is a great deal of controversy among authorities in the

field both in defining what the problem is and determining its source. Indeed, there are some who believe that there is no problem at all. Among these is Stephen Judy, who maintains that the current complaints of educators and businessmen are the same old bogies that have been periodically raising their heads since 1895.[1]

Some of Judy's colleagues believe that there has been a decline in the ability to use "standard" English, but do not believe this to be an undesirable circumstance. Elizabeth McPherson, a representative of this school of thought, was recently quoted as saying: "We tend to exaggerate the need for standard English."[2] Adding evidence to this point of view, Richard A. Lanham points out that serious questions are being raised with regard to the need for written communication in a world of increasingly oral technology.[3]

The school of thought which advocates the supremacy of the spoken over the written word is known as "structural linguistics."[4] These educators believe that, because only four percent of the world's languages have a written form, the spoken, less formal, and less structured language is the more important. They contend, as Ms. McPherson declares, that "the important thing is that people find themselves through their own language."[5]

Arguing against the structural linguists are such men as George Steiner, who complains of what he calls the "retreat from the word."[6] In fact, Johnson, Schalenkamp, and Garrison, in their book, Communication: Handling Ideas Effectively, offer a scathing denunciation of the philosophy of the structural linguistics school. "Often the person who affects a laissez-faire attitude toward language is a refugee from responsibility rather than a true disciple of liberalism."[7] These authors make cogent arguments for the necessity of written English

in our society and express the view that, in order to be effective, this written language must be structured and have generally agreed-upon rules.

Johnson, et al., cite what they believe to be an "imperative need for expression" within the human animal.[8] They maintain that knowledge is useless or, at best, incomplete until it is communicable.[9] Orienting specifically on writing, Norman G. Shidle equates good writing with good thinking[10] and maintains that "the ability to write purposefully and creatively, more than any other talent, brings personal satisfaction and success in the modern endeavor."[11] He further suggests that writing "forces" the development of abilities and skills in other areas, basing his argument on what he sees as a parallel between the process of writing and the mental exercise involved in decision-making.[12]

It is apparent, however, as Newsweek and Time magazines have recently reported, that many teachers seem to believe that rules of grammar stifle creativity and hamper spontaneity.[13] In fact, Dr. Elliott Anderson, of Northwestern University, recently charged that "many high school teachers have simply stopped correcting poor grammar and sloppy construction."[14]

Bryson and Dean point out the importance of the rules of grammar in their book Effective Communication, stating that "good habit patterns are a vital part of effective communication."[15] Finding himself in general agreement with this point of view, David K. Berlo categorizes five communication skills. These are: writing and speaking (encoding modes), reading and listening (decoding modes), and thought (both encoding and decoding modes).[16] In regard to the encoding skills and their governing rules, Berlo maintains that we must have vocabulary -- not to show we are educated but to express thought;

and that we must follow spelling and grammar rules--not to pay homage to abstract dicta, but so that we can provide a message that will have a high probability of being accurately decoded.[17] Time after time authors on the subject of linguistic rules stress their importance, not from a belief in slavish observance without thought, but from the point of view that emphasizes the practical need for such rules. Shidle holds that "word choice, sentence structure, and 'marching sentences' make the communication effective."[18] Johnson and his co-authors, discussing the rules of grammar often dismissed by the creative school, make the point that misspelling inhibits communication because of the symbology of the words and the need for proper letter arrangement in order to convey meaning.[19] But the words themselves are not really important. Bryson and Dean suggest that "a word means something only because people agree that it shall be used to represent a certain thing. Without such agreement there could be no linguistic communication."[20]

Some authorities carry the argument on vocabulary and sentence structure beyond the point of mere communication. Berlo points out that "the words we command and the way we put them together affect (a) what we think about, (b) how we think, and (c) whether we are thinking at all."[21] In short, our ability to express ourselves limits the options available to us before we even begin to verbalize them for another human being. The overwhelming majority of writers in the field are despairing of our inability to communicate (and therefore to think) as a society. William Haney makes the case well:

> It is. . . imperative that we communicate clearly and precisely. But in contrast to the technological improvements, progress toward greater understandability has come much more slowly.[22]

This is only part of the picture which the literature

reveals. The rest of the controversy revolves around assigning responsibility for the apparent decrease in linguistic ability.

Those who do not agree that the problem exists to begin with have generally attacked the validity of the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores, which caused the most recent flare-up in the controversy, and, indeed, the whole idea of standardized testing in English. Common charges are that statistically invalid SAT scores are misused by college admissions boards and that, because of their content, "tests operate to exclude blacks, poor people, Chicanos, and other minorities from professional training."[23]

Alan Purves maintains that standardized tests examine material which, due to the dynamics and modernization of education, may no longer be in the curricula of many schools.[24] Moreover, it is Purves' contention that the drop in SAT scores over the last decade is due neither to academic inability nor to poor teaching and lowered standards in the nation's schools, as has been recently suggested in the media. Rather, Purves sees the problem in mathematical terms. As he explains:

> . . . there are now more students in schools for a longer period of time than there used to be, and as the number goes up, the average may well go down. Earlier the schools did not include the "non-learner" (or) "slow-learner". . . Now these are included.[25]

William H. Angoff, an official with the Educational Testing Service, maintaining the validity of the SAT tests, acknowledges that the decline in test scores is real but suggests that American education is not at fault. Mr. Angoff believes "that the decline is idiosyncratic of the changing nature of the SAT population."[26] That is, that there has been a change in the test-taking habits of the tested population. Fewer people are repeating the test in their high school

senior years after taking it as juniors. Many high-ability students are not taking the test at all, prefering to turn to colleges and training schools which do not require testing.

On the other hand, many authors believe that the decline in verbal skills, and particularly in writing, is very real. In support of their arguments they offer mountains of evidence and a long list of possible culprits. Pulitzer Prize winner Jean Stafford blames much of the decline on television. She recently titled an article: "At This Point in Time, TV is Murdering the English Language".[27] Stafford has the support of George Steiner, who expands the theme to indict all mass media for reducing English to a semi-literate condition.[28]

Edith Efron can be considered representative of television's defenders and thinks that placing the blame on TV skirts the real issue. In rebuttal of the anti-television forces, Ms. Efron catalogs a series of trends in education which she maintains show an historic development toward liberalization and the lessening of standards in education.[29] Ms. Efron's position is bolstered by Adrian Peetoom in a recent English Journal editorial. He suggests that there has been a shift in emphasis from basic language skills because "this century has declared that there is only one kind of knowledge which deserves respect and admiration -- scientific knowledge."[30]

R. A. Lanham points to the teaching of social sciences, claiming that students are being taught to use jargon and that this usage is being reinforced by teachers, who give good grades for such performance.[31] George Steiner, agreeing with this view, says that by borrowing words from the hard sciences in an effort to sound more accurate, such disciplines as sociology have become jargonized to

the point of being "anti-literate."[32] "In persistent, unmistakable ways, English has been disappearing: She's been dwindling in schools and diminishing in colleges."[33] This assessment is supported by Kitzhaber, who cites as the reason the fact that many college English departments are not bothering to correct elementary errors, feeling that such work is below their level.[34] Thus, these minor errors are allowed to pass -- errors which are "often due to nothing more fundamental than carelessness and lack of effort."[35] Kitzhaber does not see diagramming of sentences as the answer to the problem[36] but seems frustrated by the situation's continued existence. He does posit that a solution may be long in coming unless English departments change their current policy of allowing future teachers of English to avoid taking those courses (Advanced Composition, Style, Rhetoric and Semantics) which would allow them to become proficient in the teaching of writing. Instead of taking these courses, future teachers, he says, are all literature-oriented.[37]

> According to the National Council of Teachers of English it is now possible for an aspirant who wants to teach high school English to go all the way through high school, college and advanced education degrees without taking a single course in English Composition.[38]

The implications of these varying and sometimes startling views and facts are bound to be important to the Army. However, there is one other factor which must be taken into account when discussing the relevance of these arguments to the military situation: the implications of group, or organizational, dynamics. The structure of the Army subjects the people in it to certain organizational pressures which are manifested in, among other areas, their communication behavior. For this reason, the next section of the literature review examines organizational communications.

Dynamics of Organizational Communication

Throughout this discussion, I have drawn heavily from work done in the behavioral sciences and the field of English Composition, and from contributions by government employees, both military and civilian.

In his discussion in the Art of Successful Communication, Shidle points to what may be a basic driving force behind organizational communications and the difficulties encountered in this field. He says that in "laboratories, proving grounds, and service organizations reports are often the only visible evidence of accomplishment."[39] These organizations produce no tangible results and thus their paperwork becomes their product, their "raison d'etre". The great importance placed upon writing or, more precisely, the production of written work, may be what amplifies the effects of the other pressure factors within an organization. This aspect should be of particular interest to the military professional because of the obvious analogy between the types of organizations which Shidle cites and an army in a peacetime environment.

In an organization, the "system" seems to take on a "communications life" of its own, according to many authors. McCroskey, Larson, and Knapp, for example, say that the organization compels its members to be particular kinds of communicators.[40] "The system also determines in part what kinds of messages will be sent to whom by whom."[41] All of this seems to suggest what David Berlo has called "systemstyle", a way of doing things which is characteristic of the members of a particular organization with regard to their communication behavior.[42] In this light, old cliches such as "the Army way" and "by the book" take on new meaning.

Another characteristic of the organizations which appear in

the literature is a hierarchical structure similar to our Army chain of command. It is ironic that this chain, which many see as an expeditor of communication, is seen by others as a possible inhibitor of message flow. LTC T. J. Bacham, for example, maintains that the chain of command is a model of efficiency for one way communication, but has grave doubts about its ability to move messages from the bottom to the top.[43] Heath, in "Communication and the Military Executive", maintains that the "long chain of command is one of the main inhibitors of effective communication in the military."[44]

Other authors see a hierarchical structure as a detriment to communications in terms of its effect as a behavior modifier. As Berlo suggests, "a source's position. . .will affect his general communication behavior."[45] It is logical to assume then, that as position in the structure changes (battalion staff officer promoted to company commander), communications behavior also changes. Major Lawrence J. Decunto supports this argument from the behavioralist point of view, maintaining that the world is perceived, and therefore reacted to, differently at different points in the military hierarchy.[46]

Yet another factor which seems to affect organizational communication is the supervisor-subordinate relationship within the hierarchy or chain of command. Here the concern of the authorities is less with the institution than with the interplay of the personalities involved. Brennan suggests that where a supervisor's attitude is perceived as antagonistic or non-receptive, subordinates will often send the boss what he wants to read (a criticism often leveled at the Army system) or will not report at all.[47] It is possible that such an attitude could grow to pervade the whole organization. In some organizations, there is a common fear among the members that it is

dangerous to express one's feelings truthfully.[48]

On the other hand, such a situation need not exist and, indeed, its antithesis is likely to produce both communication and production efficiency. The "supportive climate", as Haney calls it, tends to bring high performance from subordinates. This "supportive climate" is based upon what many top Army officials have been stressing for years: trust and confidence that the man will do a good job.[49]

Though the dynamics of an organization and its structure contribute to breakdowns in communication, other factors have considerable impact. The organization is fleshed out with people who may or may not be good speakers and writers. Where those organization members who are less accomplished encoders or decoders of messages operate within the inhibiting structural factors discussed above, considerable confusion can result.

The Army has its share of poor communicators. Dr. Ivan J. Birrer, Director of the MMAS program at CGSC, surveyed 65 general officers concerning their evaluations of recent CGSC graduates. These men voiced "a plaintive plea for more effective writers and speakers."[50] Moreover, an extensive study of Army education conducted by the Norris Board suggests that a wide variation in academic ability exists in the Army's officer corps. The Board found officers whose educational experience ranged from summa cum laude to semi-literate.[51] Based on the extent of this study, it seems reasonable to assume that this situation will continue. Thus, as these officers interact in the communication environment of the Army, problems arise which are both organizational and personal in character. The net result will be diminished communication efficiency in an organization which depends on accurate and rapid dissemination of information.

Just as the organization affects the way its members behave, so too the attitudes of the individual can have an impact on the ways in which he communicates. These may be attitudes toward the subject, the organization, or even the communicator himself.[52] Combined, these attitudes "determine the pattern as well as the texture of what [a person] write[s]," and therefore impede the flow of thoughts the reader is supposed to understand.[53]

Haney cites the importance of the attitude toward one's self with regard to communication. He says that "the loss of a self-image is generally warded off at all costs."[54] Thus, if the content of a message is at odds with a person's concept of himself, the message may be unconsciously modified so as to be supportive of that self-image. Obviously, the operation of this phenomenon will constitute a bar to effective communication.

Attitude toward the person or group to whom communication is directed also has an impact, particularly with regard to assumptions made by the writer. These may be false "assumptions, unconsciously held," as Haney suggests,[55] or they may be conscious as in the case of a "writer making an assumption [of knowledge] which he thinks it unnecessary to render explicit."[56] Shidle characterizes this barrier as "self-centeredness" and explains that it amounts to writing to one's self.[57]

The language itself, because it provides levels of abstraction and because people and organizations manipulate it, contributes to communicative inefficiency. Citing politicians and teachers as examples of people who are adept in the use of abstraction, Giffin and Patton explain that this technique of "non-communication" allows people to avoid each other in discussion. When challenged with a

request for information which they prefer not to answer, these people merely change level of abstraction and couch their response in terms which the questioner cannot understand.[58] This concept of avoiding another person in a communication situation can also operate without the actor's knowledge. Haney calls it "by-passing" and describes it as a situation in which "two communicators miss each other with their meanings -- either by using the same words while meaning different things or by using different words while meaning the same thing."[59]

The current societal trend toward specialization may also serve as an inhibitor of effective communication. Berlo maintains that if a person becomes too specialized, he will tend to be very technical in communication situations and thus prevent his receiver from understanding him.[60] Specialization leads to technical terminology and to jargon, neither of which is effective for communication outside of a small circle of the initiated. "Special terminology, . . . always limits -- never expands -- an audience."[61]

In regard to creating special languages, the government, and in particular the Army, are second to none. Our Army has many "in" phrases and "buzz" words and our professional language is liberally punctuated with acronyms. Colonel A. T. P. Millen takes obvious delight in commenting on "Pentagonese" in his article "Acronymania". "It is entirely possible to read a paper. . . in the American military language and understand nothing."[62] Colonel Millen also discusses one of our most prized "buzz" words: "In the United States, only a baby is conceived; ideas and PLANS. . . are conceptualized."[63]

In virtually every composition textbook I have reviewed, the author mentions the importance of the writer's remembering his reader. That is, one must phrase his message in words that will be understood. Giffon and Patton point out the importance of this concept when they

assert that "problems resulting from confusion [between author and reader] over words are countless."[64] Interestingly, they preface the chapter in which this point is raised with an example of organizational violation of this tenet. The case involved a plumber who had written to the U.S. Bureau of Standards for advice on using hydrochloric acid to clean pipes. The first answer he received went: "The efficacy of hydrochloric acid is indisputable, but the corrosive residue is incompatible with metallic permanence." Of course. the plumber did not understand and wrote again. After another letter jammed with bureaucratic verbiage, also not understood by the plumber, the U.S.B.S. finally told him not to use HCl because "it eats the hell out of the pipes."[65] This he understood!

Communication can indeed be difficult when the encoder uses words inappropriate to the receiver, but we in the military have taken this concept one step further. Professor Argus J. Tressidder of the USMC Command and Staff College points this out in his article on military vocabulary. According to Dr. Tressidder, the DoD Dictionary not only uses obscure definitions for some of its terms, but it also presents some words which are not recognized by standard dictionaries. This is not meant to imply that we should not have a professional language. It is not the existence of the language (some of which is quite colorful and precise) that causes the difficulties -- it is the all too frequent lapses into jargon and gobbledygook.[66]

On reading the scholarship cited above, one is not so amazed by the number of pitfalls in communication as awed by the thought that, given the hazards, we are able to communicate at all.

Possible Solutions

With all the evidence concerning the difficulty of writing

well, a new question arises: what can be done to improve the effectiveness of written communication? The authors in the field have some thoughts on this topic. Roy G. Foltz suggests that, from the outset, we should plan on some failure in the attempt to teach writing. He characterizes communication as an art rather than a science and suggests that, as such, it may be at least partially dependent on abilities which cannot be taught.[67]

The thrust of writing instruction in the military has recently turned to a scheme built around diagnostic testing. The tests are used to identify weak individuals, and then the technique of practice and critique is employed. This represents a departure from the older method which used a broad spectrum approach of practice and drills for everyone without reliance on objective testing.[68]

Another approach to the teaching of writing is advocated by Norman Shidle. "Next to writing frequently", he says, "reading regularly . . . is the best possible way to increase your writing skills."[69] Rudolf Flesch also suggests this close tie between reading ability and writing ability in his popular work Why Johnny Can't Read.[70] Flesch and Shidle have an interesting ally in this position. Colonel I. Degtyarev of the Soviet Army urges his young Russian officers to cultivate their communicative ability through reading artistic literature. He maintains that the classics are particularly important for they are "masters of the word".[71]

The most recent study of writing problems in the Army is Major John D. Bergen's MMAS thesis. Because Major Bergen's work was an important step, and because this thesis is an extension of that work, it deserves discussion at this juncture. The objectives of the Bergen study were to define the nature and magnitude of the

problem, to postulate the causes of the problem and test these postulates, to discover the relative severity of the causes, and to determine the relationships between the causes discovered.[72] These goals were met, and Major Bergen was able to draw some valuable conclusions. Nonetheless, there are some aspects of the Bergen study which are in need of clarification. For example, many of the relationships explored concerned attitudes and other variables compared against ability data, but this was ability as it was perceived by the person answering the survey.[73] In short, the abilities dealt with were self-evaluations rather than objectively established scores of writing ability. This was necessary because at the time the study was conducted, diagnostic data on the survey respondents were not available. "Since there was no diagnostic testing of the survey group, this [Bergen's] thesis does not attempt to correlate test scores and individual perceptions."[74]

There was an attempt to relate existing test data from a previous class to the surveyed group because of the demographic similarity between the two groups. That is, the survey group was assumed to have the same ability profile as the class from the previous year.[75] Because Major Bergen was forced to make this assumption, it seems useful to repeat the study in order to determine whether the relationships between the variables considered and perceived ability hold up when tested ability (which is unaffected by the need to maintain one's self image) is substituted for the respondents' self-evaluations. In addition, the use of tested ability will provide a method by which to categorize respondents and thus determine whether people with similar abilities have common attitudes or are demographically alike.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

This thesis uses a combination of research techniques. These are a review of literature, two surveys, and a standardized commercial English diagnostic test. These methods aim to gain insight into the various aspects of the complex topic of Army writing. Since the area of study has both subjective and objective considerations, the various facets of the topic are identified through the use of different instruments, each of which concentrates on a particular aspect of the topic.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The review of literature in the field was presented earlier in order to give the reader background, orient him to the logic of the development of the thesis, and place the topics discussed in context. Thus, the review of literature has set the stage for the discussion of research techniques which follows. The review of non-military literature was intended to survey the research which has been conducted in the civilian sector and determine its applicability to military writing problems. In this way the causes of writing problems in the civilian world can be compared with those in the military environment.

SURVEYS

Introduction

Two surveys were used. One of these is an expanded version of the instrument used by Major John D. Bergen in his 1974 study of Army writing. The modifications made are changes in wording for the sake of clarity, the addition of a small number of variables not previously considered, and the inclusion of two open-ended questions. The open-ended questions (numbers 41 and 42) provide flexibility by allowing any variables of factors not taken into account in the survey body to be covered in the form of essay answers by the respondents. These answers were examined, and any significant recurrence of responses was tabulated and considered in the analysis.

The 1975 survey is referred to as the CGSC Survey and is included at Appendix E. It may be compared with the Bergen Survey which is included at Appendix F.

The second survey used in this study is an attitude-measuring instrument which was sent to students at the Army War College. This instrument is used to provide a basis for comparison of the attitudes and perceptions of senior Army officers with those of relatively junior staff officers on the subject of Army writing. It concentrates on perceptions of subordinate ability, impact of managerial considerations, identification of preferred managerial techniques, impact of the manager on the work environment factors, and impact of the manager on the subordinates' perceptions. This survey is identified as the AWC Survey and may be found at Appendix H.

CGSC Survey

Organization. The CGSC Survey is organized into five cate-

gories as follows:

1. Demographic Data- (1) Rank, (2) Source of commission, (3) Branch or specialty with heavy writing requirements, (32) Accelerated promotion, (33) Military family (34) Educational level.
2. Ability/Training Perceptions- (4) Adequate high school preparation, (5) Adequate college preparation, (6) Good writer/speaker, (7) Areas for improvement, (10) Ratings by superiors.
3. Attitude Perceptions- (8) Preference for writing, (9) Rated others, (11) Effect of ability on career, (35-40) Job preferences.
4. Pressure Perceptions- (12-17) Environmental factors, (18-22) Management factors, (23-28) Personal factors, (29-31) Comparison of factors.
5. Other perceptions- (41-42) Opinion statements by respondents.

Sample Description. This survey was administered to five randomly selected CGSC sections. The total sample size is 247 Army officers. At the start of the school year, each section is balanced by rank, branch, and experience; therefore, these randomly selected officers should be representative of the class as a whole.

Survey Procedure. Each survey was distributed with an instruction sheet (Appendix A), a computer answer sheet, and an envelope. Students placed completed questionnaires in a box which was provided in each section surveyed.

In addition to the instruction sheet, a "Survey Manager" was

arranged for in each section. This officer's role was to attempt to generate maximum student response in his section and answer student questions should they arise.

Data Analysis. The collected student respose sheets were assigned sequential numbers and run through a scanner. The scanner "read" the answer sheets and produced a punched card deck which was then used to load the data into the computer banks. Computer System 2000 was used and a simple S2K program was written to count the responses on demand. The S2K method is unique in that the data manipulation steps need not be written into the program. This allows the researcher a great deal of flexibility in terms of the relationships he can measure as well as permitting him to change the way the data are manipulated without having to change the program.

Using S2K, the computer can be asked questions and if the results are not satisfactory, the data can be re-examined merely by changing the question--not the program. For example, the computer can be told to count the number of students who answered question 12 with response A. If, for some reason, the researcher would like this information broken out by test score, source of commission, or rank, he has merely to ask the question again adding the new parameters and the computer will provide a count of the number of students who meet the stated requirements. This method is useful also because it allows cross checks of the data to be made. This is done by asking the question in two or more ways.

AWC Survey

Organization. The AWC Survey is organized into four categories as follows:

1. Demographic Data- (1) Rank, (2) Source of commission, (3) Branch or specialty with heavy writing requirements, (4) Frequency of jobs involving writing.
2. Attitude Perceptions- (5) Rated others, (6) Rated self, (7) Ability of subordinates, (8) Effect of ability on career, (9) Need for training in the Army.
3. Pressure Perceptions/Rankings- (10-15) Environmental factors, (16-21) Managerial preferences, (22-27) Personal factors.
4. Other Perceptions- (28-29) Opinion statements by respondents.

Sample Description. This survey was administered to the 186 Army officers currently attending the United States Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pa. Though these officers, clearly, do not represent the average of their peer group, it is assumed that they do represent those officers who will occupy positions of high responsibility in the Army in the foreseeable future. Further, it is reasonable to assume that these responsible positions will involve the supervision of staff writers.

Survey Procedure. The surveys, instruction sheets (Appendix G), answer sheets, and envelopes were bulk shipped to COL Robert S. Nichols, Director of Academic Affairs, AWC. COL Nichols supervised the administration, collection, and return of the surveys. He also sponsored the survey and acted in much the same capacity as the "survey managers" had for the CGSC instrument.

Data Analysis. The data analysis of the survey results from AWC was handled in the same way that the material from CGSC was dealt

with. The results of the two surveys were then compared to discover trends and points of commonality.

Diagnostic Test

Introduction. The Houghton-Mifflin Company's College English Placement Test of writing proficiency was administered to the sample group in the first week of the academic year. This is a standardized commercial English composition test, and in this instance the examination was graded by Kansas University, Lawrence, Kansas. It serves as the means by which ability may be correlated with attitudes, perceptions, and demography.

Procedure. The students' right to privacy was well protected by the procedures used. A CGSC faculty member independently sequenced the questionnaires by section using grades achieved on the English composition test but without identifying the students by name. The students completed the questionnaires and placed them in the collection boxes. The surveyor collected the completed questionnaires and analyzed the responses. In short, the faculty member knew the student's name and diagnostic test grade (information to which he already has access by virtue of his position); the author has the student's test grade and survey responses: but no one except the individual student has access to all three of these data elements.

SUMMARY

Each of these three techniques is designed to perform different, but complementary, functions as explained above. The comparisons proposed should yield insights into the nature of the problem and describe

what differentiates a good writer from a poor one. Moreover, these insights should provide a starting point from which to formulate an Army-wide writing program which will benefit all by concentrating only in those areas where emphasis is needed and will yield results.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Background

The findings and interpretations in this chapter are based upon the two surveys and the diagnostic English test discussed in Chapter III. The technique used is to compare the data gained from the 1975-76 CGSC class with that reported by Major Bergen, and then compare those data elements with the results of the Army War College survey. As noted earlier, the survey of the 75-76 Command and General Staff College group is referred to as CGSC, and the instrument sent to the Army War College is designated AWC. When used, Major Bergen's data are identified by his name. Interpretations are made based upon the data with reference to the research presented in previous chapters.

Survey Populations

Of the 240 surveys sent to CGSC students, 164 questionnaires were returned. This represents a 68.3% return rate. The computer was programmed as explained in Chapter III, and the relationships to be explored (47 in all) were determined. The AWC survey was sent to 186 Army officers at Carlisle Barracks, Pa. Of these, 121, or 65.1%, instruments were returned in usable form and in time to be processed by the computer.

In order to understand some of the tables which follow, the reader must be aware that the CGSC survey group was examined from

several different angles to determine if the perceptions of the different sub-groups varied. The sample population was considered first as a whole: then it was examined as three mutually exclusive ability groups (Above Average, Average, and Below Average) based on diagnostic test scores. The adjectival ratings were established as follows:

Above Average--test score greater than or equal to 86 (upper 25%)

Average--test score from 66 to 85

Below Average--test score less than or equal to 65 (lower 25%)

With these groups established, additional sub-groups, based upon respondents' self-perceptions of their ability, were established for comparisons with Bergen's study. Thus, two more categories, competent writers and problem writers, emerged. Wherever it is appropriate, these groups are compared side-by-side in the tables which follow. In order to conserve space, the groups are indicated by the following designations:

TP--total CGSC survey population

AA--CGSC Above Average (test) group

AV-- CGSC Average (test) group

BA--CGSC Below Average (test) group

PC--writers with self-perceived competence

PP--writers with self-perceived problems

FINDINGS

Problem

Although the existence of writing problems in the Army has been adequately documented, there is a variety of opinion on which of these problems is most important. For this reason, it is interesting to take note of what the survey respondents believe to be their

greatest writing difficulties. The total responses (TF) from the 75-76 CGSC class confirm Bergen's findings regarding writing difficulties. These are listed below in descending order of difficulty with the appropriate percentages of students who chose each category.

Table 1

Rank Order of Difficulties

Difficulty	Rank	Bergen[1]	TF
Organization	1	33.1	24.7
Spelling and Punctuation	2	21.1	24.1
Choice of Words	3	19.5	19.1
Grammar	4	9.0	13.6

This ranking is not borne out, however, when the component groups of the CGSC sample population are considered individually. The AA, AV, and BA groups rank-ordered their writing difficulties as shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Rank Order of Difficulties by Sub-group

Difficulty	AA %/Rank	AV %/Rank	BA %/Rank
Organization	22.5/2	18.7/2	38.1/1
Spelling and Punctuation	15.0/3	28.8/1	23.8/2
Choice of Words	25.0/1	17.5/3	16.7/4
Grammar	5.0/4	15.0/4	19.0/3

Given this evidence and the assumption that the writers' perceptions of their areas of greatest difficulty are accurate, it is obvious that a corrective program based on an entire population, without taking into account the groups within that population, will not be adequate. It would seem that a remedial program based upon homogeneous grouping according to tested ability would be far more effective than one which considered only the larger group.

Causes

Major Bergen's study discovered several causes of writing problems in the Army. In the succeeding sections, each of these causes is subjected to a comparative analysis using the CGSC and AWC data.

In his study, Major Bergen found "a positive correlation between perceived writing competency and educational level."[2]

Table 3

Relationship Between Perceived Ability and Educational Level (74-75)[3]

Perceptions	Educational Level High[a]	Low[b]
Competent Writer	67.9	32.1
Writing Problems	37.7	62.3

[a]MA, MS, or PhD
[b]BA, BS, or less

The 75-76 CGSC survey group showed a similar correlation with only slight variance in the percentages involved.

Table 4

Relationship Between Perceived Ability and Educational Level (75-76)

Perceptions	Educational Level High	Low
Competent Writer	64.4	34.4
Writing Problems	46.7	53.3

However, the validity of the perceptions upon which these correlations are based deserve further research. For this reason, the tested ability groups were examined to determine their answers to the competency questions on the survey. The results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5

Relationship Between Perceived Ability and Tested Ability

Perceptions	Tested Ability AA	AV	BA
Competent Writer	72.5	54.9	38.1
Writing Problems	17.5	36.6	54.8

Though the table shows that, especially in the case of the above average student, there is a fair degree of accuracy in self-perception; the figures also show that nearly 40% of those students who tested below average perceive themselves to be competent writers with no writing problems.

Moreover, of the entire sample group (TP), only 6.3% of the

Average group (i.e., 3.1% of the total sample) have ever been rated below "Above Average" in writing ability on their OER. From this, it appears that our officer rating system drastically misrepresents officers' abilities in this area.

Table 6

Relationship Between Tested Ability and Rating Experience

Ability	Rating Experience					
	Never Rated	Outstanding	AA	AV	BA	Poor
AA (test ≥ 86)	12.5	65.0	22.5	0	0	0
AV (test 66-85)	16.4	53.2	24.1	6.3	0	0
BA (test ≤ 65)	19.0	54.8	26.2	0	0	0

With the inconsistencies between perceived and tested ability in mind, the relationship between ability and educational level should be re-examined using test data to indicate competence.

Table 7

Relationship Between Tested Ability and Educational Level

Tested Ability	Educational Level	
	High	Low
AA	68.4	31.6
AV	55.0	45.0
BA	56.1	43.9

These data show that the correlation suggested by Bergen holds true for the above-average students, but falls to almost a 1:1 ratio among the average group. More important, well over half of the below average group hold Masters, PhD, or professional degrees. This seems to reinforce the arguments of these authorities cited in Chapter II who condemn our education system for conferring degrees without imparting knowledge. The point is sometimes raised that the people concerned may hold degrees in the "hard sciences" or other non-writing oriented fields. However, others contend that it does not seem unreasonable to expect a Master's degree holder to be able to write a reasonably well-constructed English sentence regardless of his basic discipline.

The Bergen study explored perceptions of survey respondents with regard to the adequacy of their high school and college writing instruction. A high positive correlation was shown to exist between the self-perception of competence and satisfaction with high school/college preparation in writing. Conversely, Bergen found that people who perceive themselves to have writing problems, condemn their educational backgrounds.[4]

The current research confirms the Bergen findings in general, but, again, reveals some inconsistencies when the sample population is examined by test score groupings. Tables 8 and 9 illustrate the Bergen data and the more recent findings.

Table 8

Perceived AbilityVersus
Perceived Adequacy of High School/College

Perceptions	Bergen[5] HS/Coll[a]	Current HS	Current Coll
Competent Writer	95.1	73.3	81.1
Writing Problems	27.8	36.7	43.3

[a]In the Bergen study, High School and College were considered together.

Table 9

Non-military Academic Writing Preparation
Versus Tested Writing Ability

Tested Ability	Perceived Adequacy of School Preparation High School	College
AA	75.0	72.5
AV	53.6	68.3
BA	47.6	50.0

Clearly, the below average group in the recent survey expressed far more confidence in their academic preparation than was expressed by the problem writers in Bergen's group.

Major Bergen also suggested that the lack of a good remedial writing program in Army schools has worked to the detriment of Army writing. He found that those officers who thought they were ill-prepared by their high school and college experiences also felt that the Army's writing instruction was inadequate. On the other hand, those who felt secure in their non-military training had few negative

comments about the Army's system. These findings were borne out by the current study, although the spread between the two groups was somewhat reduced. A more significant relationship is illustrated in Table 10, where the adequacy of military writing education is evaluated in terms of ability groups.

Table 10

Tested Ability Versus
Perceptions of Inadequate Military Education

Tested Ability	Inadequate Military Writing Education
AA	20.0
AV	24.4
BA	38.1

The gradual increase in discontent with the military education system as ability decreases invites comment. It may mean, as Bergen suggests, the lack of a good program. It may also mean that below-average writers have had more contact with remedial programs and, thus, more opportunity and wider bases for criticism. Moreover, if, as some authorities suggest (q.v., Chapter II) the preservation of self-image is at work, below-average writers may be responding, at least in part, out of wounded pride.

Bergen determined a second possible cause of writing problems to be insufficient writing experience. He found that 37.7% of people with admitted writing problems thought them to be due to lack of experience. Only 5.7% of the subjects in Bergen's "competent" group held this opinion.[6] The 75-76 CGSC survey showed similar results,

with 38.3% of the "problem" group and 12.2% of the "competent" group sharing this view. When considered by test-determined ability groups, the differences between groups tended to be less pronounced. This is shown in Table 11.

Table 11

Tested Ability Versus
Writing Experience

Tested Ability	Lack of Sufficient Writing Experience
AA	20.0
AV	21.9
BA	23.8

With writing, as with many other skills, the attitudes and motivation of the individual can affect his performance. We do not like what we do poorly, and we do poorly those things which we don't like. Therefore, unless forced to practice some skill which we don't enjoy, it is hard for us to become better at it. Added to this is the concept that the military can be described as an action profession which generally attracts people who would prefer an active rather than a sedentary role in most situations. This view is seemingly borne out by the fact that 79.0% of the officers surveyed in 75-76 preferred to supervise an operation rather than write the plans for that same operation. Approximately the same percentage held true for the sample population when it was considered by ability groupings. Still more evidence of this preference for action tasks appears in the respondents' rank-ordered job choices. Over 78% of the students surveyed ranked

command as their first choice, while operations officer (G-3/S-3) was the overwhelming favorite for second place. Major Bergen's research suggested that these preferences are translated into attitudes toward writing.

Table 12

Relationship of Writing Preference and Attitude (74-75)[7]

Preference	Attitude	
	Positive	Negative
Writing	68.0	8.0
Action	43.0	15.5

The CGSC survey provided similar data:

Table 13

Writing Preference Versus Attitude (75-76)

Preference	Attitude	
	Positive	Negative
Writing	61.8	8.8
Action	46.1	13.3

Because of the large percentage of people who prefer action jobs, but at the same time have a positive attitude toward writing, these figures seem unconvincing and seem to indicate only a possible relationship.

When ability groups are examined as to their attitudes and

preferences with regard to writing, the data still failed to show definitive differentiation. However, they do show that the tendency for writing preferences and a positive attitude fall off as one moves along the ability spectrum from above-average to below-average.

Table 14

Tested Ability Versus Writing Preference

Preferences	Tested Ability AA	AV	BA
Writing	25.0	21.3	16.7
Action	75.0	78.7	83.3

Table 15

Tested Ability Versus Attitudes towards Writing

Attitudes	Tested Ability AA	AV	BA
Positive	57.5	50.6	40.5
Negative	7.5	15.6	11.9

Overall, there is an obvious preference for action jobs rather than writing jobs among CGSC students. This holds true even among officers with high ability in writing and strong positive attitudes toward its importance.

Another factor which could have an impact on an officer's attitude toward writing is his past experience with his rating officers.

That is, an officer's feelings about writing may be affected by the ratings he has received or, indeed, by the mere fact that his ability has been mentioned or ignored. Bergen found a relationship between these factors which revealed a slight tendency for those who had never been rated to have a negative attitude towards writing.[8] This relationship was re-examined in the current effort and the data supported it. Indeed, the tendency was more pronounced in the recent survey (30.0%) than it was in Bergen's (20.8%). As the data show, the opposite tendency also exists. The group which has been rated "outstanding" tended to be more positive towards writing than did other groups.

Table 16

Attitude Versus Rating Experience

Attitude	Rating Experience					
	Never Rated	Outstanding	AA	AV	BA	Poor
Positive	8.7	67.5	20.0	2.5	0	0
Negative	30.0	45.0	20.0	5.0	0	0

There appears also to be a tendency for those who have never been rated themselves to avoid rating their subordinates. Major Bergen first suggested this, and data from CGSC 75-76 show the same trait. Perhaps more significant is the fact that the more recent figures show a strong positive correlation for willingness to rate subordinates among those officers who themselves have been rated "outstanding". A similar, though less pronounced, tendency exists among those in the CGSC subgroup which have achieved above-average scores on the diagnostic test and also those who perceive themselves to be competent writers.

Table 17

Rating Experience Versus Rating Practices

Rating Practices	Rating Experience					
	Never Rated	Outstanding	AA	AV	BA	Poor
Have Rated Subordinates	4.5	70.2	22.4	1.5	0	0
Haven't Rated Subordinates	22.4	47.4	25.0	5.3	0	0

Table 18

Tested Ability Versus Rating Practices

Rating Practices	Tested Ability		
	AA	AV	BA
Have Rated Subordinates	52.5	38.0	39.1
Haven't Rated Subordinates	40.0	51.9	46.3

Table 19

Perceived Ability Versus Rating Practices

Rating Practices	Ability Perceptions	
	Competent	Problems
Have Rated Subordinates	62.7	32.8
Haven't Rated Subordinates	50.0	40.8

Pressures

In his research, Major Bergen explored the effects of three

pressure categories (Environmental, Managerial, and Personal) which the literature suggested could have an impact on writers.[9] He had his survey group rank-order each of the pressure factors within these categories. The results of this rank-ordering are shown in Table 20.

Table 20

Rankings of Environmental Pressures[10]

Pressure (question #)	Rank	Responses[a]
Lack of time (11)	1	66.4
No place to write (12)	2	45.4
No experts or editors (15)	3	26.7
Lack of military schooling (14)	4	24.5
Lack of experience (13)	5	22.0
Frequent job changes (16)	6	16.6

[a]Figures in this and all subsequent tables in this paper which contain pressure data represent the total percentage of responses a and b for each question mentioned.

This same group of pressure factors was ranked by the CGSC 75-76 and the AWC groups. The results for the total CGSC group and each of its component sub-groups are shown in Table 21.

Table 21

CGSC Rankings of Environmental Pressures

Pressure (question#)	Rank/Responses by Sub-groups TP	AA	AV	BA	IO	PI
Lack of time (12)	1/70.3	1/77.8	1/70.0	1/63.9	1/85.6	1/46.7
No place to write (13)	2/45.0	2/47.2	2/41.2	2/50.0	2/57.7	5/30.0
Poor mil. education (15)	3/28.0	*/22.8	3/25.1	3/38.0	3/22.2	3/33.3
No experts or editors (16)	4/24.2	3/22.9	4/25.0	5/23.0	4/13.3	4/31.6
Lack of experience (14)	5/32.1	*/22.8	5/22.5	4/24.4	5/12.2	2/38.6
Frequent job changes (17)	6/11.6	6/08.6	6/10.0	6/17.0	6/04.4	6/23.6

*position 4 and 5 yielded the same percentage response

The above table that Major Bergen's data holds true almost without exception and without regard to the sub-group being considered. What is perhaps more important is the near universality of opinion that "lack of time" and "no quiet place to write" are the most important of the environmental pressures, and that "frequent job changes" is the least important consideration from the point of view of the writer.

The opinions of writing supervisors, in the area of pressures, are as important as the perceptions of the writers themselves. Army War College officer-students were asked to rank-order the same group of environmental pressures. Their responses are shown in Table 22.

Table 22

AWC Rankings of Environmental Pressures

Pressure (question #)	Rank	Responses
Lack of experience (12)	1	59.5
Poor military education (15)	2	45.3
Lack of time (10)	3	40.5
No experts or editors (14)	4	22.5
No quiet place to write (11)	5	19.9
Frequent job changes (15)	6	13.3

It is significant that those pressures which the CGSC groups felt most acutely have dropped to third and fifth places in the AWC group, and that "lack of experience" and "poor military training" rose to positions of importance among the senior officers. In fact, the AWC group places great emphasis on the importance of writing experience and military education. When asked for their views about who should be given instruction in effective writing, 88.4% of the AWC group responded that all or most of our Army officers should receive such training.

Bergen explored the impact of managerial pressures on Army writers, and his findings are tabulated below:

Table 23

Rankings of Managerial Pressures[11]

Pressure (question #)	Rank	Responses
Lack of specific instructions (18)	1	61.4
Overemphasis on mechanics (19)	2	54.8
Buzz words (20)	3	53.1
Arbitrary editing (17)	4	28.7

The CGSC and AWC surveys in this category were handled in much the same way that the environmental pressure category was dealt with. A question on strict adherence to formats was added to both surveys, however, and a question regarding minimal editing of subordinates' work was included in the AWC questionnaire.

Table 24

CGSC Rankings of Managerial Pressures

Pressure (question #)	Rank/Responses by Sub-group TF	AA	AV	BA	PC	PP
Lack of specific instructions (19)	1/55.4	1/59.4	2/51.4	1/62.5	1/45.6	1/56.7
Overconcern with style and mechanics (20)	2/46.3	5/25.0	1/56.6	2/43.8	2/37.8	2/50.0
"Buzz" words (21)	3/35.6	3/40.6	3/30.2	3/41.6	3/33.3	*/31.7
Arbitrary criticism (18)	4/32.7	2/43.8	4/27.6	4/32.5	5/27.8	*/31.7
Strict formats (22)	5/23.3	4/32.2	5/24.3	5/15.0	4/28.8	3/43.3

*positions 4 and 5 yeilded the same percentage response

Only two of the six sub-groups correspond exactly with the Bergen

figures, but there is a high degree of correlation between the two sets of data. Of particular interest is the above-average group's rating of "arbitrary criticism" as the second most harmful pressure. It may be that when a writer reaches a higher level of competence, he becomes more sensitive to criticism and thus resents any suggestion that his work needs improvement.

In order to examine the area of managerial pressures from the viewpoint of the manager, it was necessary to modify the questions somewhat in order to include them in the AWC survey. The managerial pressure factors were presented to the AWC group as "management techniques," and the respondents were asked to rank-order them from most to least preferred methods. Their techniques equate to the pressures they produce as shown.

Table 25

Technique--Pressure Equation

AWC Technique (question #)	CGSC Pressure (question #)
Constructive criticism (16)	Arbitrary criticism (18)
Mission orders and editing (17)	Lack of specific instructions (19)
Emphasis on style/mechanics (18)	Overconcern with style/mech. (20)
Emphasis on terminology (19)	Use of "buzz" words (21)
General guidance & acceptance (20)	Not surveyed at CGSC
Emphasis on format (21)	Overconcern with form, not content (22)

The results of the AWC rank-ordering of managerial techniques are shown in the following table.

Table 26

AWC Preferred Managerial Techniques

Technique (question #)	Rank	Responses
Mission orders (17)	1	75.2
Maximum constructive criticism (16)	2	71.9
General guidance and accept work with little or no editing (20)	3	25.6
Stress style and mechanics (18)	4	15.0
Formats stressed (21)	5	9.1
Use of current terms (19)	6	3.3

It is particularly interesting that the management technique most preferred by the AWC group equates to the managerial pressure thought to be most harmful by the CGSC groups (Table 24). Moreover, the second most preferred technique used by the AWC group was rated by above-average CGSC students as the second most bothersome pressure. This subject will be discussed further in the summary.

Personal pressures are those which a writer feels within himself and which may be, at least partially, self-induced. Major Bergen has reported the importance of some of these pressures on writers as shown below.

Table 27

Rankings of Personal Pressures[12]

Pressure (question #)	Rank	Responses
Cannot focus on reader (23)	1	54.0
Cannot be frank (25)	2	53.3
Inflated language (22)	3	38.3
Lack of experience (26)	4	25.3
Avoid criticism (24)	5	14.2
Fear (21)	6	14.2

Contrasts and parallels with the CGSC and AWC groups are shown below.

Table 28

CGSC Rankings of Personal Pressures

Pressure (question #)	Rank/Responses by Sub-group					
	TF	AA	AV	BA	FC	FF
Cannot be frank (27)	1/57.8	1/69.3	1/57.9	1/48.8	1/52.2	1/53.3
Cannot focus on reader (25)	2/44.9	2/63.3	2/42.1	4/36.6	2/46.7	3/31.7
Inflated language (24)	3/35.3	3/40.1	4/32.0	3/38.1	3/41.1	*/18.3
Lack of experience (28)	4/31.5	4/16.7	3/32.4	2/40.5	4/13.3	2/50.0
Avoid criticism of writing (26)	5/10.9	6/03.3	5/07.9	5/21.9	6/04.4	*/18.3
Avoid criticism of decision (23)	6/07.3	5/09.7	6/06.5	6/07.2	5/07.7	6/06.7

Table 29

AWC Rankings of Personal Pressures

Pressure (question #)	Rank	Responses
Use inflated language (23)	1	58.5
Don't focus on reader (24)	2	42.4
Lack experience (27)	3	39.0
Are not frank (26)	4	37.0
Avoid criticism of writing (25)	5	14.3
Avoid criticism of decision (22)	6	12.5

It is significant that Army writers feel that they cannot be frank while at the same time their supervisors tend to believe that their subordinates have no great problem in "telling it like it is." Both groups agree that Army writers have a problem in trying to focus on their ultimate readers. This is in a sense ironic, as Bergen points out, in that the pressures concerned are both functions over which the manager has control.[15]

Now that each category has been covered individually, it is important to determine which of the pressure categories contains the most harmful elements.

Table 30

Rankings of Pressure Categories[14]

Categories	TP Rank/Responses	Competent Writers Rank/Responses	Problem Writers Rank/Responses
Managerial	1/42.4	2/39.3	1/35.9
Environmental	2/39.6	1/57.1	3/30.2
Personal	3/17.6	3/03.6	2/34.0

The Bergen study yielded the pressure ratings shown above, while the results from the more recent surveys are presented in Table 31.

Table 31

CGSC Rankings of Pressure Categories

Category (question #)	Rank/Responses by Sub-group TP	AA	AV	BA	FC	PP
Environmental (29)	1/45.5	1/52.9	1/42.3	1/45.2	1/45.5	1/40.0
Managerial (30)	2/38.3	2/35.3	2/41.0	2/35.7	2/38.9	2/33.3
Personal (31)	3/16.1	3/11.8	3/16.5	3/19.0	3/11.1	3/21.6

These results do not verify Major Bergen's findings. The CGSC 75-76 survey group was unanimous in the view that environmental, not managerial, pressures are the most harmful. This could be because writers are identifying such pressures with the institutional environment of the Army rather than with a specific manager. There are many circumstances where the dynamics of organizational behavior blur the artificial lines which we have drawn for academic purposes between

these categories. In these instances, individual judgement and experience will dictate whether a particular type of event (e.g., short suspense dates) will be identified as a managerial as opposed to an environmental pressure.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The findings of this thesis generally support those discovered by Major Bergen. There are some notable exceptions to this, however, especially with regard to the responses of the ability sub-groups. It is apparent from the literature in the area and supporting evidence uncovered in the diagnostic test and the surveys, that there are writing problems in the Army. Chief among these appears to be problems in organization, followed by difficulties with punctuation and grammar. These problems, however, have been shown to shift in importance from one ability group to another. The above-average group's selection of "word choice" as a more important problem than organization, suggests that these officers operate at a level where the organizational aspects of writing have already been mastered.

Another point brought out in the research concerns the reliability of self-perceptions. The accuracy of these perceptions decreased as ability decreased. This lends credence to those arguments which suggest that maintenance of one's self-image is a factor to be considered. In addition, it appears that the possession of even an advanced degree does not ensure that an individual can write well.

No information arose that would allow description of the various ability groups by demographic factors. It did develop, however, that people in the lower ability groups tend to feel that their educational preparation (both military and civilian) was inadequate.

Nor did a direct correlation appear between ability, attitudes, and preferences. Officers in all groups preferred action jobs over writing jobs and, as Bergen contends, though there was no large negative attitude towards writing, neither was there a positive one.

Perhaps the greatest insight gained from the study was the discovery of the dichotomy of views expressed by the CGSC and AWC groups. These came to light in the pressure evaluations section of the surveys. It is significant, for example, that managers do not recognize the impact of time constraints and unfavorable work environments on their writers.

In the area of managerial pressures, the study showed that the managerial pressure most bothersome to writers is equatable to the very technique which the majority of the AWC group prefer to use. Also important is the contention by above-average writers that they are pressured by arbitrary criticism, while the technique which gives rise to this pressure is high on the list of AWC managerial preferences.

In the pressure evaluations, both writers and supervisors agreed that the authors have trouble focusing on their ultimate readers and write, instead, for their supervisors/editors. This is an area where the supervisor can have an effect, if he chooses to do so. Moreover, there is evidence that the supervisor may not have an accurate picture of the conditions under which the writer operates. Members of the AWC group feel that their subordinates are frank, but the complaint from the writers is that they cannot be frank in their writing.

The last area in which this study deviated from the Bergen effort is in the evaluation of the importance of each pressure

category. While Bergen's group held managerial pressures to have the most adverse effect on writers, the CGSC survey sub-groups unanimously thought that environmental pressures are strongest. This may, after all, be a moot point because the manager can have a great impact on the environment and, conversely, the environmental elements (both organizational and physical) can shape the management techniques used.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

REVIEW

The three research techniques employed served to complement each other in the conduct of the research and the attainment of its objectives. The literature review provided background and oriented the research; the diagnostic test provided empirical data on abilities; the surveys provided the attitude and perception data.

Because of the nature of this study, the CGSC survey was almost identical to the instrument used by Major Bergen in his earlier work. The important variation on Major Bergen's technique, in regard to CGSC respondents, was the study of them in three ability determined sub-groups. This technique was made possible because the current CGSC class had been given a commercialized English diagnostic test early in the school year. The importance of this ability to classify students was not immediately obvious at the start of the research. As the data-gathering drew to a close, however, it became apparent that the majority of those areas in which deviation from the Bergen data occurred came to light through the establishment of the ability sub-groups.

A second important aspect of this research was the study of the students at the Army War College. The instrument used to survey the AWC group covered the same areas examined among the CGSC groups. The main thrust of the data collection in the AWC study was to sample

the attitudes and perceptions of the respondents regarding the pressure categories suggested by earlier research. The comparisons of AWC perceptions with those of the CGSC groups provides some of the most valuable insights into Army writing which this study revealed.

CONCLUSIONS

1. This study generally verified the existence of those specific problems suggested by Major Bergen, but the evidence indicates that their order of importance varies with the ability of the individual as well as his experiences.

2. The data gathered showed no direct relationship between demographic factors and ability.

3. The study suggests that educational level, the demographic data element which has historically been used as an indicator of academic excellence in all disciplines, is particularly unreliable as a predictor of writing ability.

4. It cannot be said that a positive attitude will produce ability. Although there is a slight correlation between a positive attitude towards writing and a high level of writing ability, many people with low tested ability still express a positive attitude towards writing and its importance.

5. There is a distinct lack of understanding between writers and their supervisors. The writers feel pressured by what they perceive to be non-specific instructions and a fear that they cannot be frank. On the other hand, supervisors favor "mission" orders and believe that the officers who write for them are "telling it like it is." This aspect of the problem is critical. If this lack of communication within the structure persists, there can be virtually

no hope of reducing the pressures which operate to the detriment of good writing.

6. As this study proved, future attempts at studying Army writing or suggesting solutions to writing problems should be based on careful diagnostic testing of the subject population. Tests should be used which are designed to provide specific data on strengths and weaknesses rather than merely to categorize examinees in general ability groupings.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

1. A study should be undertaken to verify the perceptions of the AWC group by extending the sample population to include randomly selected senior officers worldwide. If the attitudes demonstrated by the AWC group are found to be universal, steps should be taken to study the practicality of including instruction on the handling of staff writers as part of human resources management courses at senior service schools.

2. A study should be conducted to find a single English diagnostic test for use Armywide. This study should involve the identification of diagnostic tests from several sources and the administration of them to selected groups over a period of time. The object of this study would be to identify the best (i.e., most consistent) diagnostic examination. This test would be used as a point of departure from which to design remedial programs for officers found to be deficient in writing ability. If a single test which will meet the above criteria cannot be found, consideration should be given to the use of multiple tests.

3. A study should be undertaken to determine the desirability

and practicality of conducting modular remedial courses in writing which would be keyed to the specific deficiencies of a test group or an individual. Thus, if an individual's reading speed and comprehension level are what is causing him to score poorly on a diagnostic test, he would be handled far differently from a person whose score is low because he does not possess the basic composition skills and knowledge to be an effective writer.

4. A study should be undertaken to determine the value of the current CER system as a discriminator of levels of writing ability and to suggest alternative methods of evaluation.

END NOTES

CHAPTER I

1. Edith Efron, "The 'New' Illiteracy: Blaming It on TV Skirts Real Issues," TV Guide, October 25, 1975, A-5.

2. Iver Peterson, "College Textbooks Being Simplified to Meet the Needs of the Poor Reader," The New York Times, November 7, 1974, Sec. 1, p. 47, col. 8.

3. Edward Fiske, "College Entry Test Scores Drop Sharply," The New York Times, September 7, 1975, Sec. 1, p. 1, col. 2.

4. "Can't Anyone Here Speak English?," Time, August 25, 1975, p. 54.

5. Ibid., p. 55.

6. Edwin D. Canbou in Introduction to Copperud, Roy H., Words on Paper (New York: Hawthorne Books, Inc., 1961), p. 7.

7. FM 101-5, The Staff Officer's Field Manual, July, 1972, pp. 2-5.

8. Cecil Woodham Smith, The Reason Why (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1960), p. 230.

9. Ibid., p. 228.

10. FM 101-5, loc. cit.

11. "Draft Report of Conference on Army Writing," (Fort Leavenworth, December, 1974), p. 3.

12. Howard H. Calloway, "Memorandum to All HQDA Personnel; Subject: Effective Writing," 3 March 1975.

13. John D. Bergen, "The Causes of Writing Problems in the Army," (MMAS Thesis, USACGSC, 1975).

14. William V. Haney, Communication and Organizational Behavior (Homewood: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1967), p. 468.

END NOTES

CHAPTER II

1. Stephen Judy, "Who Resurrected Bonehead English?," English Journal, April, 1975, pp. 6-7.

2. Elizabeth McPherason, quoted in "Why Johnny Can't Write," Newsweek, December 8, 1975, pp. 58-62.

3. Richard A. Lanham, Style: An Anti-Textbook (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), p. 2.

4. "Why Johnny Can't Write," p. 60.

5. Ibid., p. 61.

6. George Steiner, Language and Silence--Essays on the Language (New York: Atheneum, 1967), pp. 18-19.

7. Roy I. Johnson, M. Schalenkamp, and L. A. Garrison, Communication: Handling Ideas Effectively (New York: McGraw Book Co., 1956), p. 301.

8. Ibid., p. 155.

9. Ibid., p. 98.

10. Norman G. Shidle, The Art of Successful Communication (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1965), p. 6.

11. Ibid., p. 1.

12. Ibid., pp. 1-2.

13. "Why Johnny Can't Write," p. 60.

14. Ibid.

15. Howard H. Dean and Kenneth D. Bryson, Effective Communication (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1961), p. 13.

16. David K. Berlo, The Process of Communication (San Francisco: Rinehart Press, 1960), p. 42.

17. Ibid.

18. Shidle, p. 75.

19. Johnson, et al, p. 180.

20. Dean and Bryson, p. 62.

21. Berlo, p. 43.

22. William V. Haney, Communication and Organizational Behavior, Rev. Ed. (Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, 1967), p. 4.

23. Lawrence Plotkin, quoted by Ruth Stokes in "Assessing the Assessors," English Journal, March, 1975, pp. 14-15.

24. Alan Purves, "Testing and the Recession," English Journal, March, 1975, p. 6.

25. Ibid.

26. William H. Angoff, "Why the SAT Scores are Going Down," English Journal, March, 1975, p. 10.

27. Jean Stafford, "At This Point in Time, TV is Murdering the English Language," The New York Times, September 15, 1974, Sec. 2, p. 23.

28. Steiner, p. 25.

29. Edith Efron, "The 'New' Illiteracy: Blaming it on TV Skirts Real Issues," TV Guide, October 25, 1975, A-5.

30. Adrian Peetoom, "English Literature: The Enemy Within," English Journal, May, 1975, p. 10.

31. Lanham. p. 75.

32. Steiner, p. 19.

33. Stephen Dunning, "Making Connections," English Journal, April, 1975, p. 47.

34. Albert R. Kitzhaber, Themes, Theories, and Therapy: The Teaching of Writing in College (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963), p. 22.

35. Johnson, et al, p. 34.

36. Kitzhaber. pp. 37-38.

37. Ibid., p. 15.

38. "Why Johnny Can't Write," p. 61.

39. Shidle, p. 8.

40. James C. McCroskey, C. E. Larson, and M. L. Knapp, An Introduction to Interpersonal Communication (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971), p. 188.

41. Berlo, p. 148.

42. Ibid., pp. 148-150.

43. Thomas J. Barham, Lieutenant Colonel, "The Chain of Command: Effective for Communication," Military Review, July, 1975, p. 84.

44. Edwin D. Heath, Jr., Communication and the Military Executive, Monograph (Carlilse Barracks, Pa.: United States Army War College, 1974), p. 13.

45. Berlo, p. 50.

46. Lawrence J. Docunto, Major, "Personal Communication in the Modern Army," Military Review, December, 1971, p. 75.

47. Lawrence D. Brennan, Modern Communication Effectiveness (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963), p. 406.

48. McCroskey, et al, p. 217.

49. Haney, p. 12.

50. Ivan J. Birrer, "The New CGSC Curriculum," Military Review, June, 1972, p. 21.

51. Frank W. Norris, Major General, Review of Army Officer Education System, Volume I Summary Report (Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army, 1971), p. 4-1.

52. Berlo, pp. 46-47.

53. Shidle, p. 7.

54. Haney, p. 69.

55. Ibid., p. x.

56. John Harry, The Psychology of Human Communication (New York: American Elsevier Publishing Company, 1967), p. 91.

57. Shidle, p. 17.

58. Kim Giffin and Bobby Patton, Fundamentals of Interpersonal Communication (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), p. 116.

59. Haney, p. 469.

60. Berlo, p. 48.

61. Shidle, p. 31.

62. Anthony T. P. Millen, Colonel, "Acronymania," Military Review, August, 1974, p. 51.

63. Ibid.

64. Giffin and Patton, p. 109.

65. Ibid., p. 105.

66. Argus J. Tressidder, "The Military Vocabulary," Military Review, December, 1972, p. 13.

67. Roy G. Foltz, Management by Communication (Philadelphia: Chilton Book Co., 1973), p. 112.

68. Norris, p. 11-4.

69. Shidle, p. 257.

70. Rudolf Flesch, Why Johnny Can't Read: And What To Do About It (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955), p. 3.

71. I. Degtyarev, "Command Language" (translated from Military Herald), Military Review, August, 1974, p. 29.

72. John D. Bergen, Major, "The Causes of Writing Problems in the Army," MMAS Thesis, United States Army Command and General Staff College, 1975, p. 6.

73. Ibid., pp. 57-58.

74. Ibid., p. 27.

75. Ibid.

END NOTES

CHAPTER IV

1. John D. Bergen, "The Causes of Writing Problems in the Army," (MMAS Thesis, USACGSC, 1975), p. 30.

2. Ibid., p. 31.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., p. 32.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid., p. 34.

7. Ibid., p. 35.

8. Ibid., p. 36.

9. Ibid., p. 38.

10. Ibid.

11. Ibid., p. 40.

12. Ibid., p. 41.

13. Ibid.

14. Ibid., p. 42.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS

20 November 1975

Dear Fellow Student,

The attached survey will be used as an important part of my MMAS thesis on Army writing. For the purpose of my study, Army writing is defined as that writing which is done in connection with a military position and includes staff studies, fact sheets, plans and orders, position papers, and OER narratives.

Please do not identify yourself by name or student number. Merely fill out the answer sheet with your responses and place it, together with the questionnaire containing your essay answers to questions 41 and 42, in the envelope provided. Seal the envelope and place it in the box marked "WRITING SURVEY" which will be located near your section distribution box.

If you have any questions about the survey or my study, contact me in Section 13 or call me at 5629.

Thank You,

JON C. SCHREYACH
MAJ, FA

APPENDIX B

CGSC WRITING SURVEY (75-76)
TOTAL POPULATION RESPONSES*

1. What is your rank?

A. O3	20.4
B. O4 (less than three years in grade)	38.3
C. O4 (more than three years in grade)	37.6
D. O5	3.7

2. How did you receive your commission?

A. OCS	25.3
B. ROTC	53.1
C. USMA	16.7
D. Other	4.9

3. Do you fit into any of the following categories: AG branch, JAG branch, Intelligence Officer specialty, Information Officer specialty, or any other area with heavier than normal writing requirements?

A. Yes	25.3
B. No	74.7

4. Do you feel that you received adequate writing instruction in high school?

A. Yes	58.1
B. No	41.9

5. Do you feel that you received adequate writing instruction in college?

A. Yes	65.5
B. No	33.3
C. N/A	1.2

6. Do you have any difficulty in writing or speaking?

A. Yes, I have some difficulty in both.	19.9
B. Only in writing.	17.4
C. Only in speaking.	9.3
D. No, I have no difficulty in either.	53.4

7. If you had to choose one area of writing in which you needed improvement, which would you choose?

A. None, I'm a competent writer.	18.5
B. Spelling and punctuation.	24.1
C. Choice of words.	19.1
D. Grammar.	13.6
E. Organization.	24.7

8. Would you rather write the plans for a military operation or supervise the execution of the same operation?

A. Write	21.0
B. Supervise	79.0

*all figures are given in percent on this and subsequent surveys

9. Have you ever mentioned writing ability or deficiency in the narratives of OERs you have written on subordinates?

A. Yes	41.9
B. No	47.5
C. I don't remember	10.6

10. How have your bosses generally rated your writing ability?

A. No mention has ever been made in my OER narratives	16.2
B. Outstanding	56.5
C. Above Average	24.2
D. Average	3.1
E. Below Average	0.0
F. Poor	0.0

11. Do you feel that your ability, or lack of ability, to write well will affect your career?

A. Yes, to a great degree	49.7
B. Maybe, to some degree	37.9
C. It will have little or no effect	12.4

Answers 12 through 17 will require you to rank-order those ENVIRONMENTAL factors which most adversely affected your military before you came to CGSC. Using the letters "A" through "F" put "A" next to the most harmful factor and the rest of the letters in descending order to "F" as the least harmful. Use each letter once. A space is provided on this sheet to make it easier to transcribe your ranking to the answer sheet.

EXAMPLE: What factors most adversely affect your well being today?

B Hangover (next to most harmful)
A Cold classroom (most harmful)
C Answering a survey (least harmful)

	A	B	C	D	E	F
12. Lack of time to write properly	42.4	27.9	6.3	5.7	10.1	7.6
13. No quiet place at work to write	14.6	30.4	13.3	12.7	10.7	18.3
14. Few opportunities to get experience in writing during my career	16.0	7.1	19.9	16.0	19.2	21.8
15. The military education system did not adequately prepare me to write	14.0	14.0	24.2	22.3	20.4	5.1
16. There were no experts or editors to turn to for advice	9.6	14.6	28.0	25.6	16.6	5.7
17. I changed jobs so often that I rarely could learn the standards expected in the organization	1.3	10.9	9.0	18.6	22.4	38.4

Answers 18 through 22 ask you to rank-order MANAGEMENT factors which might have adversely affected your military writing. Rank-order these in the same way, only now just use letters "A" through "E" with "A" as the most harmful factor.

		A	B	C	D	E
18.	My bosses often changed or criticized what I wrote, no matter how much effort I put into it.	17.7	15.0	17.7	12.9	36.7
19.	My bosses rarely gave me specific instructions to tell me what they wanted me to write.	29.0	26.4	17.6	18.9	8.1
20.	My bosses were more concerned with writing style and mechanics than with clear communication of ideas.	19.5	26.8	26.2	19.5	8.0
21.	I knew that there were certain "buzz" words I should use in all my writing for the boss.	14.4	21.2	26.7	23.3	14.4
22.	My bosses were so concerned with formats, that such things as paragraph numbering became more important to me than what I wrote in those paragraphs.	13.7	9.6	15.7	23.4	33.6

Please rank-order this group of PERSONAL factors in the same way by using letters "A" through "F" for answers 23-28.

		A	B	C	D	E	F
23.	I don't like to put important decisions down in writing for someone to criticize later on.	2.0	5.3	14.8	18.1	24.2	35.6
24.	I often use inflated language to impress my reader and give authority to my writing.	12.9	22.4	24.6	16.3	15.0	8.8
25.	I have difficulty focusing on the reader because so many people review my writing before it goes out.	18.4	26.5	24.5	15.6	10.9	4.1
26.	I avoid writing to avoid criticism of my writing ability.	4.8	6.1	10.9	23.1	34.0	21.1
27.	I feel that I cannot safely "say it like it is" in my writing.	36.7	21.1	11.6	17.0	7.5	6.1
28.	I simply haven't had much experience in writing.	19.9	11.6	11.6	8.9	14.4	33.6

Now rank-order the general categories of ENVIRONMENT, MANAGEMENT, and PERSONAL in order of their adverse affect on military writing. Use letters "A" through "C" with "A" representing the category which includes the most harmful factors.

		A	B	C
29.	ENVIRONMENT	45.5	33.1	21.4
30.	MANAGEMENT	38.3	50.0	11.7
31.	PERSONAL	16.1	18.7	65.2

32. Have you ever made a below-the-zone promotion to O4 or O5?
   A. Yes 21.7
   B. No 78.3

33. Are you from a military family?
   A. Yes 15.1
   B. No 84.9

34. What is your present educational level?
   A. Less than a bachelor's degree 1.3
   B. Bachelor's degree 40.6
   C. Master's degree 54.3
   D. PhD or Professional degree 3.8

Please rank-order the following group of job titles using letters "A" through "F", with "A" representing the job you would most like to hold.

		A	B	C	D	E	F
35.	Commander	8.5	13.3	5.0	0.0	1.3	1.9
36.	G-1/S-1	3.1	10.7	25.8	27.0	25.3	10.1
37.	G-2/S-2	0.6	7.6	21.6	29.1	27.2	13.9
38.	G-3/S-3	3.8	44.7	22.0	14.5	29.6	26.4
39.	G-4/S-4	1.9	8.9	14.0	18.5	29.9	26.8
40.	Other	12.8	13.4	16.1	9.4	6.7	41.6

41. Briefly describe what you think is the major problem with "Army writing" today.

42. Briefly describe what you think is the major cause of the problem which you discussed in answer to question number 41.

APPENDIX C

CGSC WRITING SURVEY (75-76)
ABOVE AVERAGE GROUP RESPONSES

1. What is your rank?
   A. O5 17.5
   B. O4 (less than three years in grade) 40.0
   C. O4 (more than three years in grade) 35.0
   D. O5 7.5

2. How did you receive your commission?
   A. OCS 17.5
   B. ROTC 47.5
   C. USMA 27.5
   D. Other 7.5

3. Do you fit into any of the following categories: AG branch, JAG branch, Intelligence Officer specialty, Information Officer specialty, or any other area with heavier than normal writing requirements?
   A. Yes 25.0
   B. No 75.0

4. Do you feel that you received adequate writing instruction in high school?
   A. Yes 75.0
   B. No 25.0

5. Do you feel that you received adequate writing instruction in college?
   A. Yes 72.5
   B. No 25.0
   C. N/A 2.5

6. Do you have any difficulty in writing or speaking?
   A. Yes, I have some difficulty in both 12.5
   B. Only in writing 5.0
   C. Only in speaking 10.0
   D. No, I have no difficulty in either 72.5

7. If you had to choose one area of writing in which you needed improvement, which would you choose?
   A. None, I'm a competent writer 32.5
   B. Spelling and punctuation 15.0
   C. Choice of words 25.0
   D. Grammar 5.0
   E. Organization 22.5

8. Would you rather write the plans for a military operation or supervise the execution of the same operation?
   A. Write 25.0
   B. Supervise 75.0

9. Have you ever mentioned writing ability or deficiency in the narratives of OERs you have written on subordinates?

A. Yes	52.5
B. No	40.0
C. I don't remember	7.5

10. How have your bosses generally rated your writing ability?

A. No mention has ever been made in my OER narra.	12.5
B. Outstanding	65.0
C. Above Average	22.5
D. Average	0.0
E. Below Average	0.0
F. Poor	0.0

11. Do you feel that your ability, or lack of ability, to write well will affect your career?

A. Yes, to a great degree	57.5
B. Maybe, to some degree	35.0
C. It will have little or no effect	7.5

Answers 12 through 17 will require you to rank-order those ENVIRONMENTAL factors which most adversely affected your military writing before you came to CGSC. Using the letters "A" through "F" put "A" next to the most harmful factor and the rest of the letters in descending order to "F" as the least harmful. Use each letter once. A space is provided on this sheet to make it easier to transcribe your ranking to the answer sheet.

EXAMPLE: What factors most adversely affect your well-being today?

B Hangover (next to most harmful)
A Cold classroom (most harmful)
C Answering a survey (least harmful)

	A	B	C	D	E	F
12. Lack of time to write properly	47.2	30.6	2.8	2.8	11.1	5.5
13. No quiet place at work to write	19.4	27.8	19.4	13.9	8.3	11.2
14. Few opportunities to get experience in writing during my career	14.3	8.5	14.3	8.6	25.7	28.6
15. The military education system did not adequately prepare me to write	14.3	8.5	28.6	28.6	14.3	5.7
16. There were no experts or editors to turn to for advice	5.7	17.2	25.7	37.2	11.4	2.8
17. I changed jobs so often that I rarely could learn the standards expected in the organization.	0.0	8.6	8.6	8.6	28.6	45.6

Answers 18 through 22 ask you to rank-order MANAGEMENT factors which might have adversely affected your military writing. Rank-order these in the same way, only now just use letters "A" through "E" with "A" as the most harmful factor.

		A	B	C	D	E
18.	My bosses often changed or criticized what I wrote, no matter how much effort I put into it.	21.9	21.9	9.3	12.5	34.4
19.	My bosses rarely gave me specific instructions to tell me what they wanted me to write.	43.8	15.6	18.7	12.5	9.4
20.	My bosses were more concerned with writing style and mechanics than with clear communication of ideas.	3.1	21.9	43.8	21.9	9.4
21.	I knew that there were certain "buzz" words I should use in all my writing for the boss.	15.6	25.0	25.0	21.9	12.5
22.	My bosses were so concerned with formats, that such things as paragraph numbering became more important to me than what I wrote in those paragraphs.	15.6	15.6	3.1	31.3	34.4

Please rank-order this group of PERSONAL factors in the same way by using letters "A" through "F" for answers 23-28.

		A	B	C	D	E	F
23.	I don't like to put important decisions down in writing for someone to criticize later on.	0.0	9.7	19.4	19.4	29.0	22.5
24.	I often use inflated language to impress my reader and give authority to my writing.	16.8	23.3	33.3	13.3	10.0	3.3
25.	I have difficulty focusing on the reader because so many people review my writing before it goes out.	23.3	40.0	16.7	10.0	3.3	6.7
26.	I avoid writing to avoid criticism of my writing ability.	0.0	3.3	0.0	26.7	43.3	26.7
27.	I feel that I cannot safely "say it like it is" in my writing.	53.3	16.7	6.7	16.7	3.3	3.3
28.	I simply haven't had much experience in writing.	6.7	10.0	23.3	13.3	10.0	36.7

Now rank-order the general categories of ENVIRONMENT, MANAGEMENT, and PERSONAL in order of their adverse effect on military writing. Use letters "A" through "C", with "A" representing the category which includes the most harmful factors.

		A	B	C
29.	ENVIRONMENT	52.9	35.3	11.8
30.	MANAGEMENT	35.3	55.9	8.8
31.	PERSONAL	11.8	8.8	79.4

32. Have you ever made a below-the-zone promotion to O4 or O5?
   A. Yes 28.2
   B. No 71.8

33. Are you from a military family?
   A. Yes 23.7
   B. No 76.3

34. What is your present educational level?
   A. Less than a bachelor's degree 0.0
   B. Bachelor's degree 31.6
   C. Master's degree 65.8
   D. PhD or Professional degree 2.6

Please rank-order the following group of job titles using letters "A" through "F", with "A" representing the job you would most like to hold.

		A	B	C	D	E	F
35.	Commander	78.9	21.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
36.	G-1/S-1	2.6	7.9	15.2	31.6	31.6	15.2
37.	G-2/S-2	0.0	7.9	15.8	31.6	26.3	18.4
38.	G-3/S-3	5.3	47.3	18.4	7.9	15.8	5.3
39.	G-4/S-4	2.6	2.6	18.4	23.8	18.4	34.2
40.	Other	10.5	15.2	34.2	5.3	7.9	28.9

41. Briefly describe what you think is the major problem with "Army Writing" today.

42. Briefly describe what you think is the major cause of the problem which you discussed in answer to question number 41.

APPENDIX D

CGSC WRITING SURVEY (75-76)
AVERAGE GROUP RESPONSES

1. What is your rank?
   A. O3 22.5
   B. O4 (less than three years in grade) 41.2
   C. O4 (more than three years in grade) 36.3
   D. O5 0.0

2. How did you receive your commission?
   A. OCS 25.8
   B. ROTC 57.5
   C. USMA 16.2
   D. Other 2.5

3. Do you fit into any of the following categories: AG branch, JAG branch, Intelligence Officer specialty, Information Officer specialty, or <u>any other area</u> with heavier than normal writing requirements?
   A. Yes 26.2
   B. No 73.8

4. Do you feel that you received adequate writing instruction in high school?
   A. Yes 55.0
   B. No 45.0

5. Do you feel that you received adequate writing instruction in college?
   A. Yes 70.0
   B. No 30.0
   C. N/A 0.0

6. Do you have any difficulty in writing or speaking?
   A. Yes, I have some difficulty in both 19.0
   B. Only in writing 19.0
   C. Only in speaking 8.8
   D. No, I have no difficulty in either 53.2

7. If you had to choose one area of writing in which you needed improvement, which would you choose?
   A. None, I'm a competent writer 20.0
   B. Spelling and punctuation 28.8
   C. Choice of words 17.5
   D. Grammar 15.0
   E. Organization 18.7

8. Would you rather write the plans for a military operation or supervise the execution of the same operation?
   A. Write 21.3
   B. Supervise 78.7

9. Have you ever mentioned writing ability or deficiency in the narratives of OERs you have written on subordinates?

A. Yes	38.0
B. No	51.9
C. I don't remember	10.1

10. How have your bosses generally rated your writing ability?

A. No mention has ever been made in my OERs	16.4
B. Outstanding	53.2
C. Above Average	24.1
D. Average	6.3
E. Below Average	0.0
F. Poor	0.0

11. Do you feel that your ability, or lack of ability, to write well will affect your career?

A. Yes, to a great degree	50.6
B. Maybe, to some degree	34.2
C. It will have little or no effect	15.2

Answers 12 through 17 will require you to rank-order those ENVIRONMENTAL factors which most adversely affected your military writing before you came to CGSC. Using the letters "A" through "F" put "A" next to the most harmful factor and the rest of the letters in descending order to "F" as the least harmful. Use each letter once. A space is provided on this sheet to make it easier to transcribe your ranking to the answer sheet.

EXAMPLE: What factors most adversely affect your well-being today?

B Hangover (next to most harmful)
A Cold classroom (most harmful)
C Answering a survey (least Harmful)

	A	B	C	D	E	F
12. Lack of time to write properly	41.3	28.7	6.3	3.7	10.0	10.0
13. No quiet place at work to write	12.5	28.7	15.8	10.0	11.3	23.7
14. Few opportunities to get experience in writing during my career	15.0	7.5	18.8	20.0	16.2	22.5
15. The military education system did not adequately prepare me to write	11.3	13.8	23.7	22.5	22.5	6.3
16. There were no experts or editors to turn to for advice	10.0	25.0	30.0	18.7	20.0	6.3
17. I changed jobs so often that I rarely could learn the standards expected in the organization	1.2	8.8	8.8	27.5	20.0	33.7

Answers 18 through 22 ask you to rank-order MANAGEMENT factors which might have adversely affected your military writing. Rank-order these in the same way, only now just use letters "A" through "E" with "A" as the most harmful factor.

		A	B	C	D	E
18.	My bosses often changed or criticized what I wrote, no matter how much effort I put into it.	14.5	13.1	21.1	11.8	39.5
19.	My bosses rarely gave me specific instructions to tell me what they wanted me to write.	22.1	27.3	15.6	22.1	12.9
20.	My bosses were more concerned with writing style and mechanics than with clear communication of ideas.	25.0	31.6	14.5	21.0	7.9
21.	I knew that there were certain "buzz" words I should use in all my writing for the boss.	15.1	15.1	34.2	24.7	10.9
22.	My bosses were so concerned with formats, that such things as paragraph numbering became more important to me than what I wrote in those paragraphs.	16.2	8.1	20.3	24.3	31.1

Please rank-order this group of PERSONAL factors in the same way by using letters "A" through "F" for answers 23-28.

		A	B	C	D	E	F
23.	I don't like to put important decisions down in writing for someone to criticize later on.	2.6	3.9	6.6	19.7	21.1	46.1
24.	I often use inflated language to impress my reader and give authority to my writing.	9.3	22.7	18.7	16.0	22.7	10.7
25.	I have difficulty focusing on the reader because so many people review my writing before it goes out.	19.7	22.4	25.0	18.5	10.5	3.9
26.	I avoid writing to avoid criticism of my writing ability.	2.6	5.3	17.1	22.4	28.9	23.7
27.	I feel that I cannot safely "say it like it is" in my writing.	34.2	25.7	13.1	15.8	6.6	6.6
28.	I simply haven't had much experience in writing.	21.6	10.8	9.5	6.8	17.5	33.8

Now rank-order the general categories of ENVIRONMENT, MANAGEMENT, and PERSONAL in order of their adverse effect on military writing. Use letters "A" through "C", with "A" representing the category which includes the most harmful factors.

		A	B	C
29.	ENVIRONMENT	42.3	35.9	21.8
30.	MANAGEMENT	41.0	47.4	11.5
31.	PERSONAL	16.5	17.7	65.8

32. Have you ever made a below-the-zone promotion to O4 or O5?

A. Yes	15.0
B. No	85.0

33. Are you from a military family?

A. Yes	11.4
B. No	88.6

34. What is your present educational level?

A. Less than a bachelor's degree	1.3
B. Bachelor's degree	43.7
C. Master's degree	52.5
D. PhD or Professional degree	2.5

Please rank-order the following group of job titles using letters "A" through "F", with "A" representing the job you would most like to hold.

		A	B	C	D	E	F
35.	Commander	78.2	11.5	5.1	0.0	1.3	3.8
36.	G-1/S-1	2.5	11.4	27.8	31.6	20.2	6.3
37.	G-2/S-2	1.3	9.0	23.1	25.6	29.5	11.5
38.	G-3/S-3	5.1	46.8	24.1	12.6	6.3	5.1
39.	G-4/S-4	1.3	9.0	11.5	16.7	35.7	25.6
40.	Other	12.0	12.0	8.0	15.3	6.7	48.0

41. Briefly describe what you think is the major problem with "Army Writing" today.

42. Briefly describe what you think is the major cause of the problem which you discussed in answer to question number 41.

APPENDIX E

CGSC WRITING SURVEY (75-76)
BELOW AVERAGE GROUP RESPONSES

1. What is your rank?
   - A. O3 — 19.0
   - B. O4 (less than three years in grade) — 31.0
   - C. O4 (more than three years in grade) — 42.9
   - D. O5 — 7.1

2. How did you receive your commission?
   - A. OCS — 35.7
   - B. ROTC — 50.0
   - C. USMA — 7.1
   - D. Other — 7.1

3. Do you fit into any of the following categories: AG branch, JAG branch, Intelligence Officer specialty, Information Officer specialty, or <u>any other area</u> with heavier than normal writing requirements?
   - A. Yes — 23.8
   - B. No — 76.2

4. Do you feel that you received adequate writing instruction in high school?
   - A. Yes — 47.6
   - B. No — 52.4

5. Do you feel that you received adequate writing instruction in college?
   - A. Yes — 50.0
   - B. No — 47.6
   - C. N/A — 2.4

6. Do you have any difficulty in writing or speaking?
   - A. Yes, I have some difficulty in both — 28.6
   - B. Only in writing — 26.2
   - C. Only in speaking — 9.5
   - D. No, I have no difficulty in either — 35.7

7. If you had to choose one area of writing in which you needed improvement, which would you choose?
   - A. None, I'm a competent writer — 2.4
   - B. Spelling and punctuation — 23.8
   - C. Choice of words — 16.7
   - D. Grammar — 19.0
   - E. Organization — 38.1

8. Would you rather write the plans for a military operation or supervise the execution of the same operation?
   - A. Write — 16.7
   - B. Supervise — 83.3

9. Have you ever mentioned writing ability or deficiency in the narratives of OERs you have written on subordinates?

A. Yes	39.1
B. No	46.3
C. I don't remember	14.6

10. How have your bosses generally rated your writing ability?

A. No mention has ever been made in my OERs	19.0
B. Outstanding	54.8
C. Above Average	26.2
D. Average	0.0
E. Below Average	0.0
F. Poor	0.0

11. Do you feel that your ability, or lack of ability, to write well will affect your career?

A. Yes, to a great degree	40.5
B. Maybe, to some degree	47.6
C. It will have little or no effect	11.9

Answers 12 through 17 will require you to rank-order those ENVIRONMENTAL factors which most adversely affected your military writing before you came to CGSC. Using the letters "A" through "F" put "A" next to the most harmful factor and the rest of the letters in descending order to "F" as the least harmful. Use each letter once. A space is provided on this sheet to make it easier to transcribe your ranking to the answer sheet.

EXAMPLE: What factors most adversely affect your well-being today?

B Hangover (next to most harmful)
A Cold classroom (most harmful)
C Answering a survey (least harmful)

	A	B	C	D	E	F
12. Lack of time to write properly	40.5	23.8	9.5	11.9	9.5	4.8
13. No quiet place at work to write	14.3	35.7	9.5	14.3	11.9	14.3
14. Few opportunities to get experience in writing during my career	19.5	4.9	26.9	14.6	19.5	14.6
15. The military education system did not adequately prepare me to write	19.0	19.0	21.4	16.7	21.4	2.5
16. There were no experts or editors to turn to for advice	11.9	11.9	26.2	28.6	14.3	7.1
17. I changed jobs so often that I rarely could learn the standards expected in the organization	2.4	14.6	9.8	9.8	21.9	41.5

Answers 18 through 22 ask you to rank-order MANAGEMENT factors which might have adversely affected your military writing. Rank-order these in the same way, only now just use letters "A" through "E" with "A" as the most harmful factor.

		A	B	C	D	E
18.	My bosses often changed or criticized what I wrote, no matter how much effort I put into it.	20.0	12.5	17.5	15.0	35.0
19.	My bosses rarely gave me specific instructions to tell me what they wanted me to write.	30.0	32.5	20.0	17.5	0.0
20.	My bosses were more concerned with writing style and mechanics than with clear communication of ideas.	21.9	21.9	34.2	14.6	7.4
21.	I knew that there were certain "buzz" words I should use in all my writing for the boss.	12.2	29.4	14.6	21.9	21.9
22.	My bosses were so concerned with formats, that such things as paragraph numbering became more important to me than what I wrote in those paragraphs.	7.5	7.5	17.5	30.0	37.5

Please rank-order this group of PERSONAL factors in the same way by using letters "A" through "F" for answers 23-28.

		A	B	C	D	E	F
23.	I don't like to put important decisions down in writing for someone to criticize later on.	2.4	4.8	26.2	14.3	26.2	26.2
24.	I often use inflated language to impress my reader and give authority to my writing.	16.7	21.4	28.6	19.0	4.8	9.5
25.	I have difficulty focusing on the reader because so many people review my writing before it goes out.	12.2	24.4	29.3	14.6	17.1	2.4
26.	I avoid writing to avoid criticism of my writing ability.	12.2	9.7	7.3	22.0	36.6	12.2
27.	I feel that I cannot safely "say it like it is" in my writing.	29.3	19.5	12.2	19.5	12.2	7.3
28.	I simply haven't had much experience in writing.	26.2	14.3	7.1	9.5	11.9	31.0

Now rank-order the general categories of ENVIRONMENT, MANAGEMENT, and PERSONAL in order of their adverse affect on military writing. Use letters "A" through "C", with "A" representing the category which includes the most harmful factors.

		A	B	C
29.	ENVIRONMENT	45.2	26.2	28.6
30.	MANAGEMENT	35.7	50.0	14.3
31.	PERSONAL	19.0	28.6	52.4

32. Have you ever made a below-the-zone promotion to O4 or O5?
    A. Yes 28.6
    B. No 71.4

33. Are you from a military family?
    A. Yes 14.3
    B. No 85.7

34. What is your present educational level?
    A. Less than a bachelor's degree 2.5
    B. Bachelor's degree 42.8
    C. Master's degree 47.6
    D. PhD or Professional degree 7.1

Please rank-order the following group of job titles using letters "A" through "F", with "A" representing the job you would most like to hold.

		A	B	C	D	E	F
35.	Commander	78.6	7.5	9.5	0.0	2.4	0.0
36.	G-1/S-1	4.8	11.9	33.3	14.3	21.4	14.3
37.	G-2/S-2	0.0	4.8	23.8	33.3	23.8	14.3
38.	G-3/S-3	0.0	38.1	21.4	23.8	16.7	0.0
39.	G-4/S-4	2.4	14.6	14.6	17.1	29.3	22.0
40.	Other	16.7	16.7	13.9	5.5	5.5	41.7

41. Briefly describe what you think is the major problem with "Army Writing" today.

42. Briefly describe what you think is the major cause of the problem which you discussed in answer to question number 41.

APPENDIX F

CGSC WRITING SURVEY (74-75)
MAJOR BERGEN'S RESULTS

1. What is your rank?
   A. O3 — 26.4
   B. O4 (less than three years in grade) — 16.2
   C. O4 (more than three years in grade) — 48.5
   D. O5 — 9.0

2. How did you receive your commission?
   A. OCS — 20.4
   B. ROTC — 50.9
   C. USMA — 19.8
   D. Other — 9.0

3. Do you fit into any of the following categories: AG branch, JAG branch, Intelligence Officer specialty, Information Officer specialty, or any other area with heavier than normal writing?
   A. Yes — 21.0
   B. No — 79.0

4. Do you feel that you received adequate writing instruction in high school/college?
   A. Yes — 61.1
   B. No — 38.9

5. Do you have difficulty in expressing yourself in writing or speaking?
   A. Yes, I have some difficulty in both — 22.5
   B. Only in writing — 10.2
   C. Only in speaking — 14.5
   D. No, I have no difficulty in either — 53.0

6. If you had to choose one area of writing in which you felt you needed improvement, which would you choose?
   A. None, I'm a competent writer — 17.5
   B. Spelling and punctuation — 21.1
   C. Choice of words — 19.1
   D. Grammar — 9.0
   E. Organization — 33.1

7. Would you rather write the plans for a military operation or supervise the execution of the same operation?
   A. Write — 15.0
   B. Supervise — 85.0

8. Have you ever mentioned writing ability or deficiency in the narrative of OERs you have written on subordinates?
   A. Yes — 44.9
   B. No — 46.7
   C. I don't remember — 8.4

9. How have your bosses generally rated your writing ability?

A.	No mention has ever been made in my OERs	16.8
B.	Outstanding	55.1
C.	Above Average	26.4
D.	Average	1.8
E.	Below Average	0.0
F.	Poor	0.0

10. Do you feel that your ability, or lack of ability, to write will affect your career?

A.	Yes, to a great degree	46.7
B.	Maybe, to some degree	38.9
C.	It will have little or no affect	14.4

Answers 11 through 16 will require you to rank-order those ENVIRONMENTAL factors which most adversely affected your military writing before you came to CGSC. Using letters "A" through "F" put "A" next to the most harmful factor and the rest of the letters in descending order to "F" as the least harmful. Use each letter once. A space is provided on this sheet to make it easier to transcribe your ranking to the answer sheet.

		A	B	C	D	E	F
11.	Lack of time to write properly	32.6	26.8	15.2	6.7	6.7	4.9
12.	No quiet place at work to write	19.4	26.1	15.8	7.9	13.3	17.6
13.	Few opportunities to get experience in writing during my career	16.4	11.6	17.7	18.3	24.4	17.7
14.	The military education system did not adequately prepare me to write.	9.2	15.4	20.3	28.8	19.0	7.4
15.	There were no experts or editors to turn to for advice.	11.5	15.2	27.9	24.9	13.3	6.7
16.	I changed jobs so often that I rarely could learn the standards expected in the organization.	8.0	8.6	12.9	12.9	20.3	37.4

Answers 17 through 20 ask you to rank-order MANAGEMENT factors which might have adversely affected your military writing. Rank-order these in the same way, only now just use the letters "A" through "D" with "A" as the most harmful factor.

		A	B	C	D
17.	My bosses often changed or criticized what I wrote, no matter how much effort I put into it.	12.2	16.5	26.2	45.1
18.	My bosses rarely gave me specific instructions to tell me what they wanted me to write.	38.7	22.7	25.8	12.9
19.	My bosses were more concerned with writing style and mechanics than with clear communication of ideas.	21.3	33.5	34.2	11.0
20.	I knew that there were certain "buzz words" I should use in all my writing for the boss.	22.6	30.5	15.9	31.2

Please rank-order this final group, PERSONAL factors, in the same way by using letters "A" through "F" for answers 21-26.

		A	B	C	D	E	F
21.	I don't like to put important decisions down in writing for someone to criticize later on.	5.6	8.6	16.1	21.0	16.7	32.1
22.	I often use inflated language to impress my reader and give authority to my writing.	13.6	24.7	21.6	16.1	13.0	11.1
23.	I have difficulty focusing on the reader of my writing because so many people review it before it goes out.	28.8	25.2	22.7	10.4	6.8	6.1
24.	I avoid writing to avoid criticism of my writing ability.	8.0	6.2	13.5	22.8	27.8	16.7
25.	I feel that I cannot safely "say it like it is" in my writing.	29.2	24.2	14.3	8.7	11.8	11.8
26.	I simply haven't had much experience in writing.	12.9	10.4	12.3	12.3	19.0	32.5

Now the rank the general categories of ENVIRONMENT, MANAGEMENT, and PERSONAL in order of their adverse affect on military writing. Use letters "A" through "C", with "A" representing the category which includes the most harmful factors.

		A	B	C
27.	ENVIRONMENT	39.6	34.8	24.4
28.	MANAGEMENT	42.4	43.6	13.9
29.	PERSONAL	17.6	19.4	63.0

30. Have you ever made an above-the-zone promotion list to O4 or O5?

A. Yes	17.4
B. No	82.0

31. Are you an army brat?

A. Yes	10.8
B. No	87.4

32. What is your present educational level?

A. Less than a bachelor's degree	5.1
B. Bachelor's degree	45.1
C. Master's degree	48.8
D. PhD or Professional degree	5.1

APPENDIX G

AWC SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS

January 1976

Dear Sir,

The attached survey will be an important part of my Master of Military Art and Science (MMAS) degree thesis here at CGSC. The topic I am studying is Army writing and, for the purposes of my study, Army writing is defined as that writing which is done in connection with a military position. It includes staff studies, fact sheets, plans and orders, position papers, and OER narratives.

A survey similar to this one has already been given to part of the current CGSC class. Your responses will be used to determine senior officer perceptions in the area of writing, and will then be compared to those of my classmates. My hope is that I will gain some insights with regard to the problems in Army writing and, eventually, be able to suggest some solutions to those problems.

I recognize that some of the lists I have provided you, especially for rank-ordering, are not all-inclusive. Unfortunately, the factors under study had to be limited in the interest of brevity. Please deal only with those factors considered in a particular question.

Please do not identify yourself in any way. Merely fill out the answer sheet, place all survey materials in the envelope, and return the packet to the Director of Academic Affairs.

Thank you for taking time from a busy schedule to help me.

Sincerely,

JON C. SCHREYACH
MAJ, FA
CGSC 75/76

APPENDIX H

AWC WRITING SURVEY

1. What is your rank?
   A. O5 — 57.0
   B. O5 (P) — 22.3
   C. O6 — 20.7
   D. O6 (P) — 0.0

2. What is the source of your commission?
   A. USMA — 19.0
   B. ROTC — 51.3
   C. OCS — 25.6
   D. Other — 4.1

3. Do you belong to a branch or specialty group such as AG, JAG, Information Officer, or Foreign Area Officer, etc. with a heavier than normal writing level?
   A. Yes — 15.0
   B. No — 85.0

4. How often have you been in a duty position which required you to supervise the activities of writers or edit and evaluate their writing?
   A. Almost never (<10% of the time) — 6.7
   B. Seldom (10% to 30% of the time) — 14.4
   C. About as often as not (40% to 60% of the time) — 37.8
   D. More often than not (70% to 80% of the time) — 25.5
   E. In almost every job I've had (>90% of the time) — 15.4
   F. In every job I've had — 4.2

5. How often have you mentioned writing ability (good or bad) in the narratives of OERs you have written on subordinates?
   A. Never — 8.3
   B. Only a few times — 29.2
   C. Frequently — 51.7
   D. I always mention it — 10.0
   E. I don't remember — 0.8

6. How do you rate your own writing ability?
   A. Poor — 1.7
   B. Below Average — 0.8
   C. Average — 30.8
   D. Above Average — 52.5
   E. Superior — 14.2

7. How would you rate the writing ability of the <u>majority</u> of the officers who have worked for you?
   A. Incompetent — 0.0
   B. Marginally competent — 31.1
   C. Competent — 51.3
   D. Above Average — 16.8
   E. Excellent — 0.8

8. Do you believe that an officer's ability to write will affect his career?

A. Yes, to a great extent	62.0
B. Perhaps, to some extent	38.0
C. It will have no effect	0.0

9. Should Army officers receive instruction in effective writing?

A. No	1.7
B. Only those who have tested below average in ability should receive instruction	9.9
C. Most should, but those who are above average in ability should not	32.2
D. Yes, all officers should receive such instruction	56.2

Responses 10 through 15 ask you to rank-order ENVIRONMENTAL factors which may have had an adverse affect on the writers working for you. Using letters "A" through "F", put "A" next to the most harmful factor, "B" for the next most harmful, and so on down to "F" for the least harmful factor. USE EACH LETTER ONLY ONCE.

	A	B	C	D	E	F
10. Lack of time to write properly	19.0	21.5	14.9	14.9	24.0	5.8
11. No quiet place to work	8.3	11.6	10.7	18.2	17.3	33.9
12. They never had opportunities to gain writing experience	44.6	14.9	14.1	15.7	3.3	7.4
13. The military education system did not properly prepare them	20.0	23.3	20.8	15.8	15.8	4.2
14. They had no experts or editors to turn to for advice	3.3	19.2	25.0	20.0	20.0	12.5
15. They changed jobs so frequently that they had no time to learn the standards expected of them	5.0	8.3	14.2	15.8	20.0	36.7

Resposes 16 through 21 ask you to rank-order MANAGERIAL methods which you might use in dealing with subordinates in writing situations. Use "A" for the technique you like best and "F" for the technique you like least.

	A	B	C	D	E	F
16. I attempt to give as much constructive criticism as I can in order to improve my subordinate's writing.	37.2	34.7	15.7	6.6	4.1	1.7
17. I prefer to give "mission" orders on writing assignments, and edit the drafts as necessary.	39.7	35.5	14.9	5.0	0.8	4.1

	A	B	C	D	E	F
18. I believe that the style and mechanics of writing are most important and impress this philosophy on my subordinates.	3.3	11.7	25.0	17.5	23.3	19.2
19. I like to have my subordinates use the most current terminology and acronyms in their writing.	0.8	2.5	14.2	25.8	31.7	25.0
20. I prefer to give my subordinates general guidance and accept their writing with little or no editing.	19.0	6.6	16.5	16.5	18.2	23.2
21. When they are doing staff papers, I require my subordinates to follow the prescribed format exactly.	0.8	8.3	4.1	28.9	22.3	25.6

Listed below (22 through 27), are some PERSONAL factors which might adversely affect the way a person writes. Based on your experience with Army writers, please rank-order these factors from the most harmful to the least harmful. Use "A" to indicate the most harmful factor, and "F" to indicate the least harmful factor.

	A	B	C	D	E	F
22. Army writers avoid putting their decisions in writing so they can avoid criticism of those decisions.	4.9	7.4	9.9	20.7	14.9	42.1
23. Army writers use too much inflated language as a means of impressing their readers.	35.6	22.9	19.5	5.1	13.6	3.4
24. Army writers don't focus on the ultimate reader. They write for intermediate readers and supervisors.	13.4	28.6	21.0	16.0	14.3	6.7
25. Army officers avoid writing in order to avoid criticism of their ability as writers.	6.7	7.6	14.3	27.7	26.1	17.6
26. Army writers do not "say it like it is."	14.9	22.3	13.2	15.7	20.7	13.2
27. Army writers simply do not have enough experience in writing.	27.1	11.9	20.3	15.3	9.3	16.1

28. Briefly describe what you think is the major problem with Army writing today.

29. Briefly describe what you think is the cause of the problem you discussed above.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Berlo, David K. The Process of Communication. San Francisco: Rinehard Press, 1960.

Berry, Dorothea M., and Gordon P. Martin. A Guide to Writing Research Papers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

Berry, Thomas Elliott. The Craft of Writing. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974.

Borden, George H. An Introduction to Human Communication Theory. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers, 1971.

Brennan, Lawrence D. Modern Communication Effectiveness. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

Brooks, Cleanth, and Robert Penn Warren. Modern Rhetoric (Shorter Edition). New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1961.

Brown, Leland. Effective Business Report Writing. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955.

Copperud, Roy H. Words on Paper: A Manual of Prose Style for Professional Writers, Reporters, Authors, Editors, Publishers, and Teachers. New York: Hawthorne, Books, Inc., 1961.

Davis, Nancy. Vocabulary Improvement. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

Dean, Howard H., and Kenneth D. Bryson. Effective Communication. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.

Ehrlich, Eugene, and Daniel Murphy. Basic Grammar for Writing. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

Flesch, Rudolf. Why Johnny Can't Read--and What to Do About It. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1955.

Foltz, Roy G. Management By Communication. Philadelphia: Chilton Book Company, 1973.

Gallagher, William J. Report Writing for Management. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1969.

Cause, John W. Guide for the Military Writer. Harrisburg, Pa.: The Stackpole Co., 1959.

Giffin, Kim, and Bobby R. Patton. Fundamentals of Interpersonal Communication. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1971.

Haney, William V. Communication and Organizational Behavior (Rev. Ed.). Homewood: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1967.

Hayakawa, S. I. Language in Thought and Action. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1964.

Johnson, Roy I., Marie Schalekamp, and Lloyd A. Garrison. Communication: Handling Ideas Effectively. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

Kitzhaber, Albert R. Themes, Theories, and Therapy: The Teaching of Writing in College. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963.

Kitzhaber, Albert R., and Donald W. Lee. Handbook for Basic Composition. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.

Lanham, Richard A. Style: An Anti-textbook. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.

Lester, James D. Writing Research Papers. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1971.

McCroskey, James C., Carl E. Larson and Mark L. Knapp. An Introduction to Interpersonal Communication. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.

Nichols, Ralph G., and Leonard A. Stevens. Are You Listening?. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1957.

Parry, John. The Psychology of Human Communication. New York: American Elsevier Publishing Company, Inc., 1967.

Percy, Walker. The Message in the Bottle. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1975.

Severeno, Kenneth K., and C. David Mortenson. Foundations of Communication Theory. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1970.

Shidle, Norman G. The Art of Successful Communication. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965.

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

Singh, Jagjit. Great Ideas in Information, Theory, Language and Cybernetics. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1966.

Steiner, George. After Babel. London: Oxford University Press, 1975.

_____. Language and Silence--Essays on Language, Literature, and the Inhuman. New York: Atheneum, 1967.

Turabian, Kate L. A Manual for Writers (3rd Ed. Revised). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Urban, Wilbur Marshall. Language and Reality. New York: The Macmillen Co., 1939.

Woodham-Smith, Cecil. The Reason Why. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1960.

PERIODICALS

Anghoff, William H. "Why the SAT Scores are Going Down." English Journal, vol. 64, no. 3 (March 1975), 10-11.

Barham, Thomas J. "The Chain of Command--Effective for Communication?" Military Review, LIII, no. 7 (July 1973), 84-87.

Birrer, Ivan J. "The New CGSC Curriculum," Military Review, vol. LII, no. 6 (June 1972), 20-26.

"Can't Anyone Here Speak English?" Time, August 25, 1975, 34-36.

Cooper, Charles R. "An Outline for Sentence-Combining Problems." English Journal, vol. 62, no. 1 (January 1973), 96-102.

Dacunto, Lawrence J. "Personal Communication in the Modern Army." Military Review, vol. LI, no. 12 (December 1971), 73-79.

Dectyarev, I. "Command Language." Military Review, vol. LIV, no. 8 (August 1974), 27-29 (Reprinted from Military Herald).

Dunning, Stephen. "Making Connections." English Journal, vol. 64, no. 4 (April 1975), 47-51.

Efron, Edith. "The 'New' Illiteracy: Blaming It On TV Skirts Real Issues." TV Guide (October 25, 1975), A5-6.

Fiske, Edward B. "College Entry Test Scores Drop Sharply." The New York Times (September 7, 1975), sec. 1, p. 1, col. 2.

Gambino, Richard. "Through the Dark, Glassily." The New York Times (July 29, 1974), sec. 1, p. 23, col. 2.

Gelfand, Louis I. "Communicate Through Your Supervisors." Harvard Business Review, vol. 48, no. 6 (November-December, 1970), 101-104.

Gensante, Leo J., Jr. "What Do You Say to a Naked Lady?" English Journal, vol. 62, no. 1 (January 1973), 80-95.

Hauser, William L. "Professional Writing: A Professional Obligation." Military Review, vol. LIV, no. 8 (August 1974), 41-48.

Hormell, Sidney J. "Public Doublespeak." English Journal, vol. 64, no. 5 (May 1975), 18-19.

Judy, Stephen N. "Writing for the Here and Now: An Approach to Assessing Student Writing." English Journal, vol. 62, no. 1 (January 1973), 69-79.

_____. "Who Resurrected Bonehead English?" English Journal, vol. 64, no. 4 (April 1975), 6-7.

Maeroff, Gene I. "H.E.W. Project Disputed on Testing of Students." The New York Times, October 23, 1975, sec. 1, p. 1, col. 7.

Millen, Anthony T. F. "Acronymania." Military Review, vol. LIV, no. 8 (August 1974), 49-52.

Murray, Donald M. "Why Teach Writing--And How?" English Journal, vol. 62, no. 9 (December 1973), 1234-1237.

Nystraed, Martin. "A Future Shocked Language?" English Journal, vol. 62, no. 2 (February 1973), 250-254.

Peetoom, Adrian. "English Literature: The Enemy Within." English Journal, vol. 64, no. 5 (May 1975), 10-11.

Peterson, Iver. "College Textbooks Being Simplified to Meet the Needs of the Poor Reader." The New York Times, November 7, 1974, Sec. 1, p. 47, col. 8.

Purves, Alan. "Testing and the Recession." English Journal, vol. 64, no. 3 (March 1975), 6-7.

"Simplifying the Language for College Students." The New York Times, November 10, 1974, Sec. 4, p. 35, col. 5.

Slotnick, Henry B. "On the Teaching of Writing: Some Implications of the National Assessment." English Journal, vol. 62, no. 9 (December 1974), 1248-1253.

Stafford, Jean. "At this Point in Time, TV is Murdering the English Language." The New York Times, September 15, 1974, Sec. 2, p. 23, col. 1.

Stillman, Richard J. "Creativity: Stymied or Stimulated?" Military Review, vol. LI, no. 12 (December 1971), 67-72.

Stokes, Ruth. "Assessing the Assessors." English Journal, vol. 64, no. 3 (March 1975), 14-15.

Swift, Marvin H. "Clear Writing Means Clear Thinking Means..." Harvard Business Review, vol. 51, no. 1, (January-February, 1973), 59-62.

Towns, W. Stuart. "Oral Communication." Military Review, LIII, no. 8, (August, 1973), 56-63.

Tressidder, Argus J. "The Military Vocabulary." Military Review, LII, no. 12, (December, 1972), 8-13.

White, Colonel John D. "Acronyms, Ambiguity, and Agriology." Military Review, January, 1976, 89-91.

"Why Johnny Can't Write," Newsweek, December 8, 1975, 58-62.

MISCELLANEOUS

Bergen, John D. "The Causes of Writing Problems in the Army." MMAS Thesis, USACGSC, 1975.

Calloway, Howard H. "Memorandum to All HQDA Personnel, subject: Effective Writing." 3 March 1975.

"Cooperative English Test, Form 1A." (Reading Comprehension and English Expression), Educational Testing Service, Princeton: 1960.

"Draft Report of Conference on Army Writing." Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, December, 1974.

Haines, Ralph E., Jr. et al. "Report of the Department of the Army Board to Review Army Officer Schools (The Haines Board)," vol. I-IV, Washington, D.C.: Dept. of the Army, 1966.

Heath, Edwin D., Jr. "Communication and the Military Executive." (Monograph). Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pa., 1974.

Haugh, Oscar M., and James I. Brown. "College English Placement Test." Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1969.

Hubiak, Basil. "Meeting Management's Needs for Adequate Communication." Master of Arts Thesis, University of Southern California, 1974.

Norris, Frank W. et al. "Review of Army Officer Education System (The Norris Report)", vol. I & III, Washington, D.C.: Dept. of the Army, 1971.

U.S. Army Adjutant General School. "Effective Army Writing: ST 12-160."

U.S. Army Command and General Staff College. "Pre-Programmed Application Library." USACGSC-ISO, July, 1975.

U.S. Army. The Staff Officer's Field Manual, FM 101-5. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.